SENATE—*Tuesday, April 28, 1992*

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 26, 1992)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable J. ROBERT KERREY, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.—II Chronicles 7:14.

God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, You made this profound promise to Your people, called by Your name. Your people know who they are. Help us hear Your word. Help us humble ourselves, pray, seek Your face and repent of our Godless ways.

Election tactics have contributed to our division, indeed our fragmentation, treating rich and poor and middle class, whatever that is, as enemies; aggravating racial and sexual differences; demeaning our political institutions. Desperately we need healing as a nation, lest this national election year reduce us to total anarchy. Help us, Lord God. Help us who profess to know You, to hear You and respond to Your gracious promise that we may be forgiven of our sins and our land healed.

For the glory of God and our spiritual restoration as a nation. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 28, 1992.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable J. ROBERT KERREY, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KERREY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order, the majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, this morning following the time reserved for the two leaders, there will be a period for morning business extending until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each. At 10:30 this morning, under a previous unanimous-consent agreement which is printed in full at page 2 of today's calendar, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 3337, the White House commemorative coins bill, with the conference report to be considered under a 2-hour time limitation, that is, from 10:30 until 12:30. From 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m., the Senate will stand in recess in order to accommodate the respective party conferences.

At 2:15 p.m., the Senate will conduct a rollcall vote on adoption of the White House commemorative coins conference report. Senators should be aware that a rollcall vote will occur at 2:15. As provided in the agreement, should the conference report be defeated, the Senate would again insist on its amendment and the Chair would be authorized to appoint conferees. Prior to the appointment to conferees, however, it is in order for Senator CRANSTON or Senator WALLOP to move to instruct the conferees. Of course, should the conference report be adopted, then the remaining portions of the agreement are moot. Mr. President, once the Senate has disposed of the coins conference report, it is my intention to then call up the conference report accompanying S. 3, campaign finance reform legislation, and I will be making a more detailed statement on that important legislation later in the day.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry, am I correct in my understanding that the Journal of proceedings has been approved to date?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal has been approved.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader time, and I reserve all of the leader time of the distinguished Republican leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 287

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair will now appoint conferees to House Concurrent Resolution 287.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. SASSER, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. EXON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. BOND, conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

NATIONAL SALUTE TO HOSPITALIZED VETERANS

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, during the week of February 9–15, the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] sponsored its annual National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans. I commend the VA for honoring those who have served our country and whose health now requires care in VA hospitals. All Americans owe a great debt to the men and women who have sacrificed so much to serve their country and who are now hospitalized.

Americans have always cared for their own, and believed that those who risked so much for our freedom deserved the best of medical care. I recently visited the VA Medical Center in Decatur, GA. As with every visit to a VA facility, I came away with a renewed gratitude for the veterans who have given so much for the cause of freedom.

After this visit, I came out determined to ensure that VA hospitals have both the moral and budgetary support to serve the veteran community. I normally applaud the desire to cut the cost of Government programs, but cutting services and VA health care personnel in the face of growing need is not legitimate cost savings. Commensurate with the Federal fiscal restraints we face, we should take the steps necessary to ensure the availabil-

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

ity of high quality medical care for deserving veterans.

Earlier this year, the Department of Veterans Affairs own Advisory Committee for Health Research Policy concluded that VA research "is inadequately supported to achieve its goals." Nearly 80 percent of VA research proposals that were approved by merit review are not funded in the administration's fiscal year 1992 budget.

Last October, the Commission on the Future Structure of Veterans Health Care criticized recent declines in funding for the VA medical care system and warned that unless funding is increased, the system cannot meet its obligations to veterans in the next two decades.

While medical costs jumped 117 percent during the decade of the 1980's, VA funding increased by only 10 percent in constant dollars. The resulting funding gap has produced a $1 billion backlog for replacing equipment, long waiting lists for services, closed beds and lower employee morale. As the veteran population ages, the stress on the system becomes even greater.

There are 20,370,000 American veterans today, and the reduction in military forces will swell that number by 1.5 million more by 1995. Currently more than 44,000 veterans are hospitalized long-term, and nearly 960,000 are receiving short-term care.

Our Nation has been blessed that we have not had to fight our battles in our own land in this century. Our cities and farms and forests have not been bombed or strafed and destroyed by enemy fire. Our children have not known war or seen their mothers and grandparents and friends shot down in the streets.

We owe that safety to those young Americans we sent to foreign shores to fight for our freedom. They slogged through mud and snow, desert and jungle, enduring physical hardship and lonely vigils, diseases unknown to our land and dreadful injuries—all for our sake.

And now we owe those same Americans who sacrificed so much to keep us safe—the old and frail, the young who will never leave their hospital beds—the best of medical care.

I am grateful that a week in February was set aside to salute hospitalized veterans. Americans should be aware that, every day and every week, we enjoy the benefit of living in a free society because our veterans answered the call of duty. It is our duty to keep faith with them as they did with us.

TRIBUTE—DEPARTMENT COMMANDER JOSEPH F. CHASE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 2, 1992, Joseph F. Chase will be honored by the Pennsylvania American Legion at a testimonial dinner for his outstanding leadership as department commander. But the story of this proud American does not start and stop with his current position of department commander, a position which he has served faithfully and with great distinction for the past year. The true story of Joe Chase covers a lifetime of dedication to the American Legion and achievements in its behalf. His loyalty to his fellow Legionnaires and his dedication to this country's ideals of democracy, freedom, and duty are etched in stone.

A veteran of the Korean war, Joe Chase has been a proud member of the American Legion for over 25 years. The founder and only adjutant of his post, the Spirit of 76 Post 676, Joe has also been active on all levels of the American Legion from the national organization to the post level.

His other positions of responsibility have included those of eastern vice commander, eastern section adjutant, 1st district commander, and post commander. Additionally, he served a 2-year term as president of the Post District Commanders Association and a 1-year term as secretary of the Pennsylvania American Legion Press Association.

In addition, Joe is currently serving a 3-year term on the National American Legion Magazine Commission. Last year, he completed his 10th assignment as Department Public Relations Committee chairman.

Of special pride to Joe is his origination of the Department of Pennsylvania's Blue Cap of the Year Award, a recognition which is presented annually to Pennsylvania's outstanding Legionnaire.

A graduate of Villanova University, Joe served as the university's sports information director for 5 years. Following this assignment, he was selected as a public relations officer for the city of Philadelphia, where he served with distinction for 24 years.

Joe is married to a lovely lady, Louise Chase, who is a past eastern vice commander and two-term fourth district commander. Louise has also served as Joe's eastern section adjutant. They live in Horsham, in Montgomery County.

The American Legion and the State of Pennsylvania are proud of Joe Chase. Upon the occasion of the testimonial dinner in his honor, I take this opportunity to recognize him before the U.S. Senate.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS HEESAKKER

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Wisconsin's most dedicated public servants, Outagamie County veterans services officer Francis Heesakker. Francis will be retiring at the end of April after 46 years of working with Appleton area veterans and I want to share with my colleagues a few comments about this distinguished individual.

Francis' own military career earned him numerous commendations and awards. While serving with the U.S. Army's 7th Cavalry in the Pacific Theater during World War II, he was seriously wounded twice during the Battle of Luzon, losing a limb and earning a Purple Heart with an Oak Leaf Cluster. His list of decorations also includes three Bronze Campaign Stars, American Theater Ribbon, Asiatic-Pacific Theater Medal, Philippine Liberation Medal with two Bronze Stars, U.S. Army Good Conduct award, and Distinguished Unit Badge.

After returning home in 1946, Francis began working for the Outagamie County veterans service office and 10 years later became the county's veterans service officer. Over the years, he has used his unique personal experiences in the military to help veterans from World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and others who, like him, have answered when their country has called. He has touched the lives of hundreds of veterans and their families and his work has served as a model of public service.

Wisconsin has been truly fortunate to have Francis Heesakker as its veterans services officer for Outagamie County for nearly four decades and I know his counsel and experience will be missed.

NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE AWARDS TO SENATOR JEFFORDS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on April 9, 1992, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund honored my distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator JAMES JEFFORDS, and I had the pleasure—and I might say I had the honor—of introducing Senator JEFFORDS at the awards dinner on April 9. I say the "honor" because I have known JIM JEFFORDS for certainly all of my public life. We served in different public offices in Vermont—he in the State senate, and then as attorney general of the State, and Congressman, and now as a U.S. Senator from Vermont.

In the House of Representatives, JIM JEFFORDS led the charge to pass the Civil Rights Restoration Act after the Grove City decision, to enact the Americans With Disabilities Act, and to protect older Americans from employment discrimination. As a Member of this body, he has continued his commitment to fairness and dignity for all Americans.

He was a crucial Republican sponsor of the Civil Rights Act in the Senate. There are some, I must say, in his party, who seem to like the idea of wielding the quota weapon at supporters of the bill.

But JIM JEFFORDS refused to exploit racial tensions for political gain. He recognized the power of the civil rights law to bring people together, to heal old wounds and encourage optimism

about the future. His tireless work with Senator KENNEDY and Senator DANFORTH to craft the civil rights bill is a tremendous achievement.

It should also be noted that Senator JEFFORDS gets no political benefit for this. This is not a case of representing a State with a large minority population. In fact Vermont has the smallest minority population of any State in the Union.

JIM JEFFORDS did it because it was right, because it adhered to the best principles of the party that he represents. So I was delighted to take part in the ceremony because I am proud of my colleague's work. I am proud of the State we both serve, and the honor he brought to the State of Vermont. And I am proud to be his friend.

JIM JEFFORDS has earned the respect and admiration of his State and I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement of Senator JEFFORDS at the Equal Justice Awards Dinner on April 9.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES M. JEFFORDS, EQUAL JUSTICE AWARDS DINNER, APRIL 9, 1992

Let me begin by thanking the Legal Defense Fund for bestowing this honor upon me. If I have been able to contribute, it is in large part due to the help of the people in this room, and to colleagues like Ted Kennedy and Jack Danforth, Ham Fish and Gus Hawkins.

In fact, I've spent a career in Congress following Gus Hawkin's footsteps—onto the Employment Subcommittee in the House and then on to serve as his counterpart on the Republican side of the Education and Labor Committee. And tonight I follow him as a recipient of the Equal Justice Award. Gus alone makes this pretty fine company I am joining.

Though we often worked together in the House, Gus Hawkins and I could not have represented more disparate districts. More than just geography separates Watts and the whitest state in the nation. But political leadership involves taking on each others' problems. Gus did this for me, and I tried to understand the problems his constituents faced—day in and day out.

By no means are the problems of racial discrimination absent in Vermont. Sadly, a state full of church steeples and village greens has seen a cross burning and other ugly incidents of late.

But on the whole, I am blessed in being able to represent a state with a fine tradition of tolerance. Vermont was the very first state to abolish slavery in its Constitution, doing so, in fact, when it was still an independent republic. It was a hotbed of abolitionism. And when President Lincoln put out the call, Vermont freely sacrificed many of its sons for the Union—more for its size than any other state.

That, I suppose, is ancient history in a town where news gets stale faster than bread. But these are the roots, I think, of a very progressive state when it comes to issues involving civil rights. And for some reason, Vermonters seem to live with their history more than most people.

I represent a state with a strong commitment to equal opportunity. What other state—without any affirmative action policy—would hire such a diverse workforce in Congress, with a Republican, Democrat and Independent?

But my commitment to civil rights is more than a matter of representation. It's a matter of conviction. My parents and ancestors worked toward this end, and it seems only natural to carry on their work.

Thus, while a lot of my friends in the House and Senate have become frustrated and have chosen to retire, I think we have accomplished a great deal in many areas, civil rights among them. I entered the House with Tim Wirth, and served as an Attorney General alongside Warren Rudman, and I will miss them greatly. But while I share their frustration, I am excited by the challenges still before us.

There is still a long ways to go. But for the most part, our laws secure a solid set of rights and remedies. They are not perfect, and will continue to be the source of frustration and debate for litigators and legislators for years to come. And I think we can count on this Supreme Court to make its own unique contribution.

But we do seem to have a consensus in Congress that equal justice—even in its arcane forms of disparate impact and mixed motive cases—must be maintained and strengthened.

That consensus is not impervious—to demagogues, to hard times, to demography. You know better than I that it is a constant struggle. The LDF has over 50 years of experience to my relatively brief tenure in Congress. But I can tell you that I see the need—even in my state in which I take great pride—to continue a healthy dialogue and the process of education.

That's my job as well as yours. And I can assure you that I have tried to explain to my constituents why real remedies are necessary. Discrimination is all too alive and well, not just in some distant southern state, but in my own state as well.

Basically good, decent people in this country are apprehensive about their future, and their children's future. Their government has failed them by racking up record amounts of red ink. They see additional protections against discrimination as burdens with little benefit. Discrimination, in their mind, is a thing of the past.

You and I know it is not, but somehow, we are failing to convince many people and some policy makers of that.

We have the rights and remedies we need for the most part. But rights and remedies without education and understanding will lead to bitterness, not betterment.

Probably the bigger question in my mind these days is not so much about rights and remedies as about the vast numbers of minorities who will barely see their way into a high school classroom, let alone a court room.

Rights and remedies that do not lead to economic opportunity and absorption into a receptive society will not lead to the kind of nation we claim to be.

Yes, much has been done. But there is so much more to do. There will be no success until we provide to victims of prejudice and discrimination better economic hope than the peddlers of dope; or to women who peer through the glass ceiling a path to success rather than empty regrets.

The needs are brought home every night I go home. When not in Vermont, I live on the increasingly infamous Capitol Hill here in Washington.

I don't consider myself a particularly cautious person, but I don't park on the street, I don't walk around any more than I have to at night, and I am always nervous when my adult children do.

But my concern is not so much for my own safety as for what the symptom of crime represents for Washington and cities in general. What's happening to these kids? Where are they going?

Most will hang in there and persevere, thanks to a strong parent, or teacher or church. But the deck is stacked unfairly against them.

As research by the Center for the Study of Social Policy just found, Washington, D.C. ranks dead last in 8 of 10 indicators of child well-being. It's a grim fact that Washington, once jokingly known as last in the American League, is now last in controlling infant mortality, violent teen deaths, and high school dropouts.

In hard times, with a big budget deficit, generosity is in short supply. Frankly, I am not sure that we can rally support across this country to tackle the problems of the inner city on the basis of some of the past arguments for equity.

Whatever their environment, adults make choices, in the popular view. We have seen, I think, a rising tide of individualism that borders on Social Darwinism, a lessening of communal spirit that accompanies diminished expectations.

But if there is one reservoir of good will, I think it lies with our children. Children generally can't make choices, and are excused if they make bad ones. If we are to appeal to the nation, I think it must be on the basis of saving our children.

This may be criticized as triage. Maybe it is. It certainly is not pleasant, but it is the best route I can see. In order to make real changes, and in order to secure broad support, I think we have to focus on the future, and try to cope with the present as best we can.

There will not be massive increases in federal spending for our cities. But I think that gradually we can increase our spending for the building blocks of a better society; health care, nutrition, education, and training.

We are at critical juncture in our history, abroad and at home. The end of the Cold War, the collapse of communism, and the rise of multilateralism have given us the opportunity to dramatically decrease the resources devoted to defense. We can now, for the first time in my life, really hope that future international battles will be fought with brains and not bombs.

But the battle against communism has beggared us. Defense spending and deficits have climbed steadily over the past 15 years. We are bringing defense spending down, but we must do likewise with deficits, for they are crushing domestic spending.

We also need to take care in what we are doing. For better or worse, the military offered a path for many disadvantaged Americans into the mainstream of life. With a 100,000 fewer entrants a year, what will we do to replace its role?

We need to be careful, but as we work to put our budgets into balance, we need not—must not—forgo resetting priorities and trying to better address human needs. I support making entitlements of WIC, Head Start and Pell Grants, and want to create a national health care system.

I suppose this is heresy for a Republican. But if Pat Buchanan can have a vision for the Republican Party, so can I. I want to return to our future.

For just as I feel like Vermont's roots are my own, so, too, do I feel close to the roots

of the Republican Party. The Republican Party was born as the party of equal opportunity, and Republicans must not forget those roots.

The Civil War galvanized not only Vermont's commitment to civil rights, but that of the Republican Party's. As Lincoln put it after four years of bloodshed had put 600,000 Americans in their graves:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds . . .

Today's wounds are neither as mortal or as visible as those of 130 years ago. But it is time to bind up our wounds, to take stock and make firm and hopeful plans, with a bit of dreaming about the future course of this country.

Lincoln saw, before the last guns have been fired, that it was time to set a new course. It is that time again.

Even in this election year, when there is a cacophony of caution, we must clamor for real, not symbolic, change. I hope that we will see meaningful, maybe even radical reform, in the near future. The road to true equality stretches before us filled with turns and grades, but lighted by the possibility of great progress.

But I am preaching to the choir. This organization has been in the vanguard of change for over fifty years, and will be for years to come.

God and Vermonters willing, I hope to continue to help you in the causes you have so nobly advanced. I am deeply grateful for this award and thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. RIEGLE. Will the Senator then yield a moment on the issue of Senator JEFFORDS?

I want to join with my colleague in commending Senator JEFFORDS. I think it is important he has been recognized for important leadership that he has given on civil rights issues. It is not surprising that he should be honored because he has a long record along that line.

As one who once served on this side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, I admire that leadership going back, as it does in the history of the party, to the leadership of people like Abraham Lincoln. It has unfortunately been missing, I am afraid, in large degree, with some notable exceptions like Senator JEFFORDS.

The only point I would make is this. I think it is important that when good things are done my Members on either side of the aisle, that we acknowledge those across the party aisle. I think it is significant that a Democratic Senator is willing to come and pay a deserved tribute to a Republican colleague on matters of substance. I think this is the road we ought to be on more of the time. I want to draw attention to that fact.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his comments, justly deserved.

RECOGNITION OF FORMER YUGOSLAVIA REPUBLICS MUST INCLUDE KOSOVA

Mr. PRESSLER. Like the dinosaur and the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia no longer exists. Today, President Bush adjusted United States policy to correspond to this reality. I commend the President for his decision to recognize Croatia, Slovenia, and Bosnia-Hercegovina. Recognition sends a signal to Belgrade that the United States will no longer allow that regime to strong arm its neighbors.

However, I also want to stress the urgency of the need to extend the recognition process to Albanian populated Kosova. In addition, the Albanians of the former Yugoslavia must be given a seat at the peace table in Brussels.

Having lost control of Croatia and Slovenia, Belgrade may increase its already crushing pressures on Kosova. Like a number of others in Congress, I strongly support recognition of Kosova. For this reason, in February I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 96, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should recognize the independence of the Republic of Kosova.

The Albanians represent the third largest ethnic group in the former Yugoslavia. Yet they have been excluded from the peace talks in Brussels. If a true and lasting peace is to be achieved in the countries emerging from the former Yugoslavia, several things must occur.

First, Yugoslavians of Albanian descent must be given a place at the peace talks. Second, martial law must be lifted in the Republic of Kosova. Third, Kosova must be recognized as an independent state. Finally, free elections, conducted under international supervision, must be allowed to occur in Kosova.

The United States should not tolerate further bloodshed in the former Yugoslavia. That is why I recently introduced the Former Yugoslavia Act of 1992, which, among other things, calls upon the President to tell Congress what he will do to recognize those regions and Republics within what was Yugoslavia that desire independence. The legislation also requires the President to tell Congress what he will do to end Belgrade's military aggression or occupation in the former Yugoslavia and to bring violators to justice. I am delighted that, to date, Senators DOLE, D'AMATO, and HELMS have joined me in this effort.

Artificial countries like the former Yugoslavia should not be preserved against the will of the people. Standing for the principles of freedom and independence, the United States can assist the peoples of the former Yugoslavia to enjoy independence and peace.

I hope the President's announcement of recognition will begin that process. I commend him for his action. However, I believe he should continue the process. It is my hope that he will move rapidly to address the needs of the Albanians of Kosova in the manner I have outlined.

NATIONAL NURSES' WEEK IN ALABAMA

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Gov. Guy Hunt recently proclaimed the week of May 4–10, 1992, National Nurses Week in Alabama. This designation coincides with the American Nurses' Association's celebration of their profession's outstanding contributions to our health delivery system.

Of course, we could not survive without the dedicated services of our nurses. Besides their primary mission of helping save lives, they provide comfort and lift the spirits of the sick and infirmed. And yet, we often take their work for granted, not realizing how very important they are, or how tremendous their responsibility. Nurses fill needs not met by any other health care providers, and are required to make an intense, demanding commitment throughout their professional lives.

Through the many enlightening activities associated with this year's National Nurses' Week, the theme of which is "Nursing: Shaping the Future of Health Care," it is my hope that we will pause, reflect, honor, and acquire a stronger appreciation for nurses, their professionalism, and their unyielding commitment to quality health care. It is important for them to be recognized for the valuable knowledge they possess and the important service they provide.

I proudly commend and congratulate Alabama's nurses for choosing a career of serving others through healing and comforting. I am happy to join all of their friends, colleagues, and family in recognizing our nurses during their special week.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Hunt's proclamation designating May 4–10 National Nurses Week be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ALABAMA—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, registered nurses in Alabama represent the largest group of health care providers in the state; and

Whereas, nurses make a difference in the lives of people they serve every day by demonstration of their unique combination of qualities—clinical knowledge, sound judgement and the ability to care; and

Whereas, the demand for nursing service is greater than ever because of the aging population, the ability to sustain life through advanced technology, changes in the setting where health care is delivered, changes in health care financing and the changing health care needs of today's consumers; and

Whereas, more qualified nurses will be needed in the future to meet the increasingly

complex needs of health care consumers in Alabama; and

Whereas, the Alabama State Nurses' Association and the American Nurses' Association have designated May 4–10 as National Nurses Week and ASNA has accepted the theme "Nursing—Shaping the Future of Health Care" in celebration of the ways in which nurses contribute to high quality patient care and improvement of our health care system:

Now, therefore, I, Guy Hunt, Governor of the State of Alabama, do hereby proclaim May 4th through 10th, 1992, as "National Nurses Week" in Alabama, and I urge all citizens to join me in celebrating nursing accomplishments and recognizing nurses for their unique contributions and their ability to have a positive impact on the lives of those for whom they care.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR TIMOTHY WIRTH

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, this body, along with the people of the State of Colorado, was stunned a few weeks ago by the unexpected retirement announcement of our friend and colleague, Senator TIMOTHY E. WIRTH. Like the absence of other Members who have announced that they will not seek reelection this year, the departure of Colorado's senior Senator will leave a tremendous void that will be difficult for the 103d Congress to fill.

TIMOTHY WIRTH has worked hard during his tenure in Congress to advance educational and environmental causes. He possesses a keen intellect, a tireless energy, and the kind of work ethic that any legislator should strive to emulate. Everyone in this Chamber, whether they agree with him on the issues or not, knows him to be a dependable man of his word, arguably the most admirable quality a Senator can have.

It is truly distressing to see the Senate losing Members of the caliber of TIMOTHY WIRTH. The April 20, 1992, edition of U.S. News & World Report, in a discussion of the alarming number of national legislators calling it quits this year, describes the Coloradan as a star-quality lawmaker "most voters would yearn to have represent them." He is "smart, principled, effective * * *" Whatever problems this institution has won't be helped by his leaving.

We certainly wish the distinguished Senator well. TIMOTHY WIRTH's leadership and command of the issues will be sorely missed when the new Congress convenes next year, but we hope the future holds much happiness and fulfillment for him and his family.

NO RETREAT ON U.S. AGRICULTURAL POSITION IN GATT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, last week in Geneva, I met with Deputy U.S. Trade Representative Rufus Yerxa about the status of negotiations in the Uruguay round of GATT talks. I am very concerned over what I perceive as the possibility that U.S. negotiators may be preparing to give ground on the issue of agricultural subsidies. I rise today to oppose in the strongest terms possible any such action.

Last year, In introduced Senate Resolution 227 to establish U.S. Senate policy that meaningful reforms with respect to agricultural subsidies must be achieved in the GATT negotiations. By meaningful, I mean any new GATT agreement must ensure freer and fairer trade for American farmers and ranchers. Growth in international trade is key to the future of U.S. agriculture. We must open more world markets to U.S. farmers and ranchers.

The Uruguay round was originally scheduled to be concluded in December 1990. At that time the United States was calling on the European Community [EC] to reduce its domestic subsidies by 75 percent and its export subsidies by 90 percent over a 10-year period. This demand already marked a retreat from the original U.S. position of eliminating all agricultural subsidies. The EC balked and walked away from the negotiations.

In December 1991, efforts were again made to reach a consensus for a new agreement. Though the United States continued to insist on its modified position, discussion centered on a 36-percent reduction in export subsidies and a 20-percent reduction in domestic subsidies over a 6-year period.

Mr. President, at that time, I wrote the President and the U.S. Trade Representative urging them not to back down from our demands that Europe cease to practice agricultural protectionism. No consensus was reached, and GATT-Director General Arthur Dunkel proposed a draft final agreement embracing a 36-percent reduction in export subsidies and 20-percent reduction in domestic subsidies over a 6-year period. The so-called Dunkel proposal is now the center of negotiations on agricultural trade in the Uruguay round.

Current negotiations to establish new trading rules in agriculture focus on three areas: internal support, market access and export competition, Mr. President, the United States must insist that measurable improvements be made in each of these areas if the Uruguay round is to be successful.

I was alarmed by some of the things I learned in my meeting with Ambassador Yerxa. As I mentioned at the outset, I was left the impression that the United States may be preparing to retreat dramatically from its demands that the EC reduce its agricultural subsidies. This should not be permitted to happen. If these proposed changes in our negotiating position occur, I and many other farm State Senators will be very disappointed. I will fight any GATT rules that hurt American farmers and ranchers.

The reason for this position is simple. The EC spent nearly $31.3 billion on agricultural supports and export programs in 1990. That amount was over 4½ times the $6.8 billion spent by the United States.

Since 1987, EC agricultural subsidies have increased nearly 60 percent and are expected to total $43.54 billion this year. In that same time period, U.S. agricultural subsidies have decreased 44 percent and are expected to total $13 billion this year. Mr. President, there is no reason to believe that, without meaningful reform, EC agricultural subsidies will not continue to rise in the future.

What has been the result of these subsidies? EC output of the three major oilseeds—rapeseed, sunflower seeds, and soybeans—rose to a record 12.6 million tons in 1990. EC grain stocks soared in 1990–91 to a record 18.8 million tons. This was a 60-percent annual increase and surpassed the previous record set in 1985.

Mr. President, as a result of excessive agricultural subsidies, the EC overproduces in the agricultural sector by approximately 20 percent. The EC's Common Agricultural Policy [CAP] shields its farmers from market forces, generates excessive surpluses, and depresses world market prices—all to the detriment of U.S. farmers and ranchers. As a result of the EC's export subsidies, the EC has gone from being a net importer to a major net exporter of such products as beef, sugar, and wheat.

Excessive EC export subsidies have led to the dumping of EC agricultural surpluses on world markets. This has meant lost markets and lower prices for South Dakota's and America's farmers and ranchers. Through it all, the administration promised it would insist on fair treatment for our farmers. The proposed concession, if it occurs, would mark a retreat from that position.

Elimination of EC agricultural supports, such as variable levies and export subsidies, could boost U.S. exports in all markets between $4 and $5 billion, while at the same time reduce U.S. imports about $2 billion, according to industry sources. Among key commodities, U.S. grain exports could rise about $1.8 billion with imports dropping $22 million. Meat and egg exports could increase $1.3 billion while imports could fall almost $2.4 billion.

Mr. President, if realized, the effect of such gains would be substantial. Every billion dollars' worth of agricultural exports means 26,000 jobs here in the United States.

Allowing the EC to continue its protectionist agricultural subsidy programs means that South Dakota farmers and ranchers would continue to face unfair foreign competition. Every farmer and rancher in South Dakota knows that higher grain, dairy and meat prices depend on better access to foreign markets. EC export subsidies

deprive our producers of billions of dollars in foreign sales.

Mr. President, another area that demands meaningful reform in the GATT is how international agricultural trade rules are enforced. There are several instances in which current GATT rules have failed to resolve major trade disputes. For instance, in 1990 the EC banned shipments of beef from all U.S. plants, claiming the plants did not meet EC standards. The problem was that U.S. plants did not follow the exact standards in place in the EC. American standards for beef are at least as strong as in the EC. In some cases they are superior. However, since they are not the same, this trade dispute continues. The EC's ban on beef containing hormones restricts the sale of U.S. beef as well.

These nontariff trade barriers not only have impaired U.S. sales to the EC, they have helped cause an extreme surplus situation in the EC beef market. The EC likely will resort, as it has in the past, to subsidizing the sales of surplus commodities overseas—at the expense of U.S. agricultural exports.

Another excellent example of some of the problems with current GATT rules concerns the EC oilseed regime. A unique feature of GATT is that once a tariff concession is made, it cannot be rescinded and affected countries cannot be compensated. In 1962, during the Dillion round of the GATT the EC bound its oilseed—soybeans, sunflowers, et cetera—import tariffs at zero—that is, it removed all import duties on the commodities. At that time, the EC was in need of oilseed imports. However, since 1962 that situation has reversed.

In the 1970's, EC grain production grew tremendously. By the late 1980's the EC went from being a net importer of 20 million tons of grain to a net exporter of 20 million tons of grain. To reduce its huge grain surplus, the EC began subsidizing its farmers who switched from grain to other crops like oilseeds. Not surprisingly, U.S. exports to the EC of oilseeds such as soybeans fell 63 percent. In 1987 the United States filed a suit against the EC alleging the EC oilseed subsidies violated international standards by discriminating against oilseed imports and, as a result, the zero-bound tariff on oilseed was impaired. Two GATT rulings have favored the U.S. position, yet the EC oilseed regime remains in place and the dispute continues. U.S. farmers, processors and exporters are losing $2 billion annually in sales to the EC as a result of its illegal oilseed regime.

A new GATT agreement that meaningfully addresses the issue of EC agricultural subsidies would increase the U.S. share of world export markets in grains and meats. Such an agreement would likely result in little change in government supports and higher market prices for most U.S. commodities. World prices for most agricultural commodities would likely be higher than under a continuation of current policy. Reducing export subsidies and import barriers would increase world demand relative to world supply. Mr. President, U.S. taxpayers, and U.S. grain, oilseed and livestock producers will benefit from meaningful GATT reforms.

But concessions on these issues by U.S. negotiators are a bad idea. The administration must not back down at this stage of the negotiations. The United States has reduced substantially its agricultural subsidies over the past ten years, while the EC dramatically has increased subsidies. We must keep pressure on the EC to make major reductions in its export subsidies programs. This is essential if U.S. farmers and ranchers are to have any hope for a decent return on their hard work and investment.

A new agreement also would shape significantly the future economic growth of the world's developing and lesser developed countries. The concessions afforded those countries would determine their future economic growth and potential for development. This could be significant for the United States, since 40 percent of U.S. agricultural trade is with the world's developing and lesser developed countries.

As I stated earlier, controversy over reductions of agricultural subsidies has deadlocked the current round of GATT negotiations. Just this past week, the deadline was extended to June 1992.

Mr. President, the Dunkel proposal submitted in December 1991 does not go far enough. The uneven playing field on which U.S. farmers and ranchers currently must compete will remain so even under the Dunkel proposal. Our negotiators must level this playing field by insisting on further concessions from the EC.

The United States is trying to find common ground for an agreement on agricultural issues, but this has proven elusive. The drama of the negotiation process will continue and any final agreement probably will be reached in an 11th hour deal. Agriculture has become the key to breaking the current deadlock. Other areas of dispute will remain unresolved until a consensus is reached on agriculture. Unless a significant reduction in agricultural subsidies—at both the export and domestic levels—is achieved, the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations will continue for quite some time.

None of this is reason enough for U.S. negotiators to back away from this country's current position on agricultural subsidies. They should not. For too long, America's farmers, ranchers and the economy itself have suffered unfairly as the result of nontariff trade barriers. What the deadlock does mean is that the Uruguay round may fail in its objective to create a more level playing field upon which the world's trading nations could compete fairly.

CLIFFORD L. ALEXANDER RECEIVES THE EQUAL JUSTICE AWARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on April 9, 1992, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund honored both Senator JAMES JEFFORDS and Clifford L. Alexander, Jr. Cliff Alexander and I have known each other, really, almost from the time I came to the Senate. He served with distinction in the President's Cabinet. We met, oft-times on issues of national defense and such matters. But since then on a whole host of different matters.

Cliff Alexander is one of these people who is extremely knowledgeable in subjects of both domestic and foreign policy matters. On April 9, he spoke to one of the most important domestic matters, the need to eliminate bigotry in our society. Clifford Alexander spoke as a black to the NAACP. But he spoke of the problems Jews face, when anti-Semitism comes up; Latinos face, Japanese face, that everybody faces who has bigotry against them in this society. I think Cliff Alexander is one of the giants of our society.

I ask unanimous consent his entire statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the materials was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CLIFF L. ALEXANDER, JR., AFTER RECEIVING THE 1992 EQUAL JUSTICE AWARD

We are not going to eliminate bigotry in this or any other society. But we certainly can dramatically reduce this lingering bad human habit. The NAACP Legal Defense Fund has responded eloquently to the vestiges of slavery and segregation. It has been a leader in the battle for equity.

Let me, however, make this suggestion to each one of us in this room. Get outraged when someone from a group other than your own is under attack by the bigots.

African-Americans need to stop turning their backs to anti-semitism. When a Jew is under attach for being Jewish, there is no excuse for silence by any of us.

The most prevalent daily drumroll of hate is now aimed at the Japanese. Japan's economic policies are in excuse for too many to condemn people of Japanese origin—including those who are American citizens. We should be outraged at the manifestations of narrowminded hatred directed at people of Japanese ancestry. Racist remarks by some Japanese leaders in no way justified an attack on Japanese people. Where are the front page stories quoting our leaders expressed their outrage at this? Why are we not taking on the narrowminded business and political leaders who are direct in their condemnation of the Japanese as a people?

The armies of Americans who believe in fair play see it first and foremost as fair play for people who are in their group. These armies get big and bad when they see the threat as personal. When it is someone else's group under attack they say it is not their fight.

How many times have you read when a Latino was under unfair attack that "The

Latino Community was up in Arms". Then the article goes on to quote a "Latino leader". Well on such occasions many of you who are not Latino are upset too! Tell the papers to question people of other backgrounds to see how they react publicly to injustice done to "another" group.

Yes we have to be outraged by bigotry and not on a superficial level. Along with the need to condemn bigotry directed at other groups, it is the responsibility of the media to treat racism and sexism with thoughtfulness and depth. Only then will its perniciousness be fully understood. An example: why so much time by the media on Bill Clinton's golf game at a golf club that excludes? Where is their coverage of people who belong to these clubs and play there in their segregated worlds year round. Do you think if they do not admit blacks to their club they are going to treat African-Americana fairly when they supervise African-Americans in the workplace?

We need more passion today. Passion for what is right and good. Passion for someone other than those who come from the same background we do. If you are against bigotry wear it on your sleeve. The sleeve of your multicolored coat.

TRIBUTE TO BRANDON DEMESY BROWN

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, today I rise to tell you about a courageous family that truly is an inspiration to other families in Edina, MN. In September 1989, Dr. David, Jeanenne, Andrea, and Casaundra Brown lost their son and brother, Brandon DeMesy Brown. They have overcome their grief in order to share Brandon's love and to keep his enthusiasm alive for other children.

At 12 years, Brandon possessed a magic on ice. Whether it was figure skating or hockey, he had natural ability and grace coupled with competitive ambitions. When he was 9 years old, he won a Minnesota State championship in figure skating. A year later, he won the Upper Great Lakes Championship.

He was a joy to watch during his artistic performances of figure skating, and he was a joy to cheer during the suspense of hockey. Coaches and fans did not doubt that it might be possible for Brandon to someday achieve his goals to represent the United States as a figure skater and as a member of the United States hockey team.

Brandon was a champion because he believed that "sooner or later the man who wins is the one who thinks he can." Brandon excelled in academics, sports, and relationships. He was able to dream and a winner because of the empowerment that he received from his family and friends. He was well on the way to fulfilling his dreams, when he collapsed from severe respiratory distress playing football on his school's playground.

As mere humans, we do not comprehend the reasons for such tragedies of life, but with faith we know that life is an endless one. It was once said, that "we can't measure the excellence of a painting by the size of the canvas or the excellence of a life by its length. None of us knows how big our canvas on Earth will be, but as long as we live on Earth, each day we are adding a touch to the picture we leave for those who come after us."

Actually, Brandon's life and personality were influenced by the wonderful collection of people he met. Brandon had the exceptional gift to easily express and share that love. His life painted a picture of glowing colors that provided happiness and inspiration to friends and acquaintances. Just before his death, Brandon wrote a paper on friendship for his sixth grade class. It was called, "Friends Forever". "Friends should be honest." "A friend should be kind to your other friends." "Sharing is the thing that makes a great friend." "Friends should respect your ideas." And, "Friends who are thoughtful are friends to keep."

Awarded, annually, to outstanding athletes is the Brandon DeMesy Brown Friendship Award in hockey and ice skating. Today, the Brown family, the Edina Hockey Association, the Edina community, and the Braemer Arena for Ice Sports continue to remember Brandon by honoring his example of friendship and sportsmanship. In the spring, the Braemer City of Lakes Figure Skating Club also sponsors a companion award. These awards are memorials to Brandon and serve as an inspiration to recipients encouraging them "to be a champion * * * to excel in all things we try."

Brandon certainly had an enthusiastic love of life and expressed this through friends, academics, and athletics. The Brown family and their community are to be commended for encouraging youth to experience their fullest potential.

TRIBUTE TO YOSHIKI OTAKE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a very distinguished businessman, Yoshiki Otake. Mr. Otake is the president of the Japan Branch of the American Family Life Assurance Co. of Columbus, GA. He was also a close associated and friend of the late John Amos, the founder of AFLAC and a man who was greatly respected by a number of us in this body.

Mr. Otake was instrumental in the founding of AFLAC's Japan branch, and he has guided it since its beginning in 1974. Under his leadership, the branch has grown a relatively modest endeavor into one of the premier insurance companies in Japan, with 30 percent of the insurance business in the country. Mr. Otake advised Mr. Amos on Japanese culture and business practices, and encouraged him to let Japanese run the day-to-day operations of the branch.

AFLAC's success in Japan is a testament to both Mr. Amos' vision and Mr. Otake's outstanding leadership. In addition, it is an excellent example of how U.S. businesses can succeed in this very different but promising market.

TOM KAHN, A MAN WHO MADE A DIFFERENCE

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, Ben Wattenberg has written a fine memoir of the late Tom Kahn, who for two decades here in Washington carried on the struggle against world communism from the perspective of the democratic socialist parties of the West. This is a tradition too little understood in our own country, save perhaps in cities such as New York and within the international labor movement. It was altogether appropriate that Tom Kahn in his last years was head of the International Affairs Department of the AFL–CIO. Earlier he had been an aide to our beloved former colleague "Scoop" J. Jackson. Always and everywhere he was a witness for truth in the struggle with totalitarianism.

It has saddened me that since coming to the Senate after a campaign in which Tom Kahn's great friends Penn Kemble, Carl Gershman, and others were indomitable and indispensable supporters, our views seem thereafter to have diverged. I would hope that with time this divergence might be better understood. For my part there is a record of sorts. In 1977, on entering the Senate, I became a member of the Intelligence Committee. Reading intelligence briefs on the Soviet Union I came to the conclusion—which I resisted at first—that the U.S.S.R. was not just a failed society, but that it was a fissile society as well. That it was going to break up along ethnic lines. And that this breakup would most likely happen in the 1980's. I first spelled out this view in Newsweek in 1979. Thereafter I found myself with little sympathy for the evil empire rhetoric of the Reagan years. Not that the empire was not evil, but rather that it was going to cease to be an empire at any time and that was the eventuality for which the West need to prepare. In matters ranging from arms control to emergency relief.

But nothing can detract from the shining example of Tom Kahn. That the Young People's Socialist League of the Lower East Side of the 1920's should have finally found a foreign policy home in a conservative Republican administration in Washington of the 1980's is a vast irony. But also and not least, a credit to all concerned. Rest in peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Ben Wattenberg's tribute to Tom Kahn be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 21, 1992]

A MAN WHO MADE A DIFFERENCE

(By Ben J. Wattenberg)

Because ideas have ancestors, and because ideas have consequences, let me tell you about my friend Tom Kahn. He died recently, too soon, at age 53. But he lived an important life.

I met Tom in 1971 when he came to Washington to be a speechwriter on the presidential campaign of Sen. Henry "Scoop" Jackson. At the scribbler's trade, he was the best. He had the two qualities great speechwriters need: He could write in American, and he had thought-out ideas.

I used to kid Tom that he and his activist friends were a cabal, ingeniously trying to bury the Soviet Union in a blizzard of letterheads. It seemed that each of Tom's colleagues—Penn Kemble, Carl Gershman, Josh Muravchik and many more—ran a little organization, each with the same interlocking directorate listed on the stationery. Funny thing: The Letterhead Lieutenants did indeed churn up a blizzard, and the Soviet Union is no more.

I never did quite get all the organizational acronyms straight—YPSL, LID, SP, SDA, ISL—but the key words were "democratic," "labor," "young" and, until events redefined it away from their understanding, "socialist." Ultimately, the umbrella group became "Social Democrats, U.S.A." and Tom Kahn was a principle "theoretician."

They talked and wrote endlessly, mostly, about communism and democracy, despising the former, adoring the latter. It is easy today to say "anti-communist" and "prodemocracy" in the same breath. But that is because U.S. foreign policy eventually became just such a mixture, thanks in part to those "Yipsels" (Young People's Socialist League), with Tom Kahn as provocateur-at-large.

On the conservative side, foreign policy used to be "anti-communist," but not very "pro-democracy." And foreign policy liberal-style might be piously "pro-democracy," but nervous about being "anti-communist." Tom theorized that to be either, you had to be both.

It was tough for labor-liberal intellectuals to be "anti-communist" in the 1970s. It meant being taunted as "Cold Warriors" who saw "Commies under every bed," and being labeled as—the unkindest cut—"right-wingers."

The parentage of ideas is complex; they often emerge from many places simultaneously. In Washington, Tom's idea-mongers found a hospitable environment in both the labor movement and the "Scoop Jackson wing" of the Democratic Party.

In George Meany and Lane Kirkland of the AFL–CIO the Yipsels found heroes. In national union offices some of them found jobs, as Tom did at the AFL–CIO. By the early 1980s, when the Solidarity labor union challenged Polish communism, Yipsels were already in place in Washington as labor's foreign policy shock troops.

Tom Kahn saw the future early. He wrote in 1981 that the events in Poland should be seen as part of a process that could "dismantle" communism. Later, he headed the AFL–CIO International Affairs department.

The AFL–CIO did the most to keep Solidarity alive (with help from the Pope and Ronald Reagan). Ultimately, Solidarity broke the legs of communism, and the great ugly beast fell, just as Tom said it would.

Tom was in character as one of Scoop's Troops in the fight for human rights and the promotion of democracy. He had cut his teeth in the civil-rights movement, and in 1963, as Bayard Rustin's assistant, he drew up the conceptual plan for the March on Washington.

The Labor/Jackson combine started "the democracy movement." It was boosted by Jimmy Carter's human-rights push and sent into orbit by a profound irony: Many conservative Republicans made common cause with some union Democrats, who were their arch-adversaries on domestic matters.

That marriage was made in part by "neoconservatism," which had some roots in Yipsel-think, and came to influence Reagan's foreign policy, which, not-so-strangely, often sounded Kahnish: anti-communist, prodemocracy, hard-line.

Tom died too young, of AIDS. In the modern war of ideas he was a player, a founder—and a winner. That is some solace for his many admirers in the democracy movement who will continue the work in a quite new era that his consequential ideas helped create.

SHARON PERCY ROCKEFELLER: PUBLIC TELEVISION'S CHAMPION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I passed up my usual cup of coffee this morning. Who needs caffeine when you can substitute a feisty op-ed piece by Sharon Percy Rockefeller in the morning Post?

In her column, "Big Bird: Someone Didn't Do His Homework," Mrs. Rockefeller very eloquently sends George Will to the principal's office for his schoolyard bullying of public television. In an earlier column, Will had beat up on Big Bird and other PBS heroes as elitist indulgences, undeserving of public subsidy. Of course, this is nonsense, and this morning's column does a fine job of setting the record straight.

The fact is that Members of Congress are as hooked on WETA and MacNeil-Lehrer as our kids and grandkids are hooked on "Sesame Street" and "Reading Rainbow." And when you think that only 6.2 percent of WETA's $43 million budget comes from the Federal Treasury, I just cannot imagine a better value for the dollar in Government today.

I give a lot of the credit for this success to Sharon Percy Rockefeller, the president of WETA Television and Radio since 1989, and a leader of public television dating back to 1977—both back home in West Virginia and here in Washington as a member of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's board of directors.

Mr. President, Members of this body know and admire Sharon Percy Rockefeller. One Senator was lucky enough to marry her. We respect her enormous talents and energy in so many endeavors—first and foremost as a dedicated mother of four children. As president of WETA, she works to enrich our lives in a very direct way and on a daily basis. She has earned not just our admiration, but our gratitude.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Rockefeller's column from this morning's Post be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG BIRD: SOMEONE DIDN'T DO HIS HOMEWORK

(By Sharon Percy Rockefeller)

George Will's column "Who Would Kill Big Bird?" [op-ed, April 19] portrays public television as an example of the "welfare state gone awry"—a vehicle for entertaining the rich and powerful at the expense of the ordinary taxpayer. While it is refreshing to see Mr. Will in his guise of a populist, he has neglected to do his homework. His statements about public television are often distorted, often just plain wrong. Some examples:

Citing "The Civil War" to point out the "ample cable, broadcast and home video markets . . ." available to public television is like using Thomas Alva Edison as an example of why all inventors should make money. It is also 20/20 hindsight. Where were all those potential investors when a young, unknown filmmaker came to public television and proposed 11 hours of photographs buttressed by music and voice? They were salivating over "Roseanne." WETA—and public television—believed in "The Civil War" and Ken Burns, and supported him from the moment he began his research. Furthermore, we supported him not because his program looked good on a financial forecast but because we felt that what he had to say was important. Our yardstick was good programming, not profit.

A more apt question for Mr. Will to consider: Would private investors fund the hundreds of hours of extraordinary television on PBS that are not potential blockbusters but nonetheless inform, enrich, educate and delight viewers? Of course not.

Is WETA's audience "an advertiser's dream"? Perhaps, if we sold advertising; but we don't. We tried once: In the early 1980s, public television conducted an FCC and congressionally authorized 10-market advertising experiment. It confirmed that our programming could not generate enough advertising revenue to support the system, and concluded that continued government funding was essential.

The fact is that public television remains the only place a viewer can watch operas, ballets symphonies or public affairs documentaries the way they were designed to be watched—without commercial interruption. Public television stations need public support precisely because their value lies in producing and broadcasting high-risk programs of quality that do not necessarily make money. Just ask the networks.

Mr. Will believes that because of cable television, the audiences once served by public television will be served by the expanding marketplace. He is wrong. More outlets do not necessarily mean more choices; an increase in quantity does not automatically result in more diversity or higher quality.

Radio offers an example. Dozens of stations dot the dial; yet they complete for audiences with a few formats: talk, news, rock and roll, country, some classical. There is nothing like National Public Radio's "All Things Considered" or "Morning Edition" anywhere in commercial radio. Why does Mr. Will assume that the television environment without PBS would be any different? Perhaps he should examine the British system, where recent efforts to force broadcasters to rely on advertising for funding threaten to push documentaries and cultural programming right off the air.

Mr. Will selectively quotes statistics to imply that public television is an elitist activity. In fact, the demographics of public television closely mirror the demographics of the American population. A third of public television households have annual incomes of less than $20,000, and 60 percent earn less than $40,000. Recent surveys of the "Sesame Street" audience show that the program reaches nearly a quarter of all U.S. households with incomes under $10,000 over half of the Hispanic households that have children, and over 40 percent of African-American households with children. "Sesame Street" is also shown in thousands of day care centers. This is elitist?

Mr. Will's statistics are distorted partly because he fails to distinguish between viewers and members—between those who watch and those who contribute to public television. His failure is disingenuous: It stands to reason that members are most likely to be drawn from the more affluent viewers. Like all other institutions that rely on contributions, public television has a membership that is more skewed to the higher income groups than its viewership.

But the most troubling part of Mr. Will's column is his extraordinarily crabbed view of the role of our government. He concludes that government should consign public broadcasting—and by extension other cultural institutions—to the forces of the marketplace.

Yet, as he has often reminded us, our government was formed to promote not just life and liberty but also "the pursuit of happiness." In this effort it assists all sorts of institutions: public schools, universities, libraries, hospitals, museums, symphonies and national parks. Historically the province of the elite, these institutions have now become available to everyone. We spend a tiny portion of the federal budget on them; in fact, only 6.2 percent of WETA's $43 million budget comes directly from the federal government via the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The idea behind this support is always the same—that promoting access to education, the arts and the outdoors enriches the whole society. Far from being elitist, it is one of the great unifying themes of our country. By giving everyone access to Beethoven and Dickens, Alvin Ailey and Leonard Bernstein—and, yes, to Ken Burns and Big Bird too—we improve ourselves.

Is Mr. Will against all such support—or just that for public television? Does he deny that government has a role in perpetuating the cultural vitality of society? If so, he should come out and say it. If so we differ.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRYAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend, the Chair informs the Senate that morning business is now closed.

WHITE HOUSE COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 3337, with the time from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled under the previous order. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3337) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the Two-Hundredth Anniversary of the White House, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of April 7, 1992.)

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Nevada. The legislation we are now considering is the second conference report to H.R. 3337, the White House Commemorative Coins Act. This legislation contains not only the 1992 White House commemorative coins, but other coins including the 1992 Christopher Columbus Commemorative Coins Act, the 1992 Persian Gulf Veterans Silver Medal Act, the 1993 James Madison Commemorative Coins Act, and the 1994 World Games Commemorative Coins Act.

Each of these provisions, which I will describe a little bit later, enjoys wide bipartisan support in both the Senate and the House. All of these bills have been introduced separately. However, because of time considerations they were packaged together into H.R. 3337.

It is important that this conference report be passed now in order to give the Mint sufficient time to begin to design and otherwise begin the production processes for the two 1992 commemorative coin programs, which of course come first, and where time is truly of the essence.

Surcharges from the sales of the White House commemorative coins would go to the White House Preservation Fund, and that is used for the upkeep of the public rooms in the White House that millions of visitors to Washington see each year. In fact, people going through the White House and visiting the public rooms is one of the main things that tourists do here in Washington.

This is a modest program in this area and one which the Mint has indicated that it can execute and that they have sufficient time to do so. But time in that area is, as I say, running out. The 1992 Christopher Columbus Commemorative Coins Act would set up a foundation and establish a scholarship program to encourage and support research and study designed to produce new discoveries in all fields of endeavor, for the general benefit of mankind.

The third coin, the 1992 Persian Gulf Silver Medal Act, would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to present a unique silver medal to all of the brave men and women who served in the Persian Gulf conflict. Then, bronze duplicates would also be authorized for sale to the general public. We all know it has been over a year since the Persian Gulf conflict ended and I believe it is appropriate for us to take this step, to honor the service of those military and civilian personnel who performed so well for our country.

The surcharges for the 1993 James Madison commemorative coin program will ensure that the foundation can provide at least 1 and possibly 2 scholarship programs for eligible teachers in each and every one of the 50 States, so they in turn are better equipped to be able to teach their students about our U.S. Constitution.

And, finally, the 1994 World Cup Commemorative Coins Act will celebrate the first time that the United States has ever hosted the World Soccer Games. The House overwhelmingly passed it in August 1991. This soccer competition, the World Soccer Games, means millions of dollars in tourist business, not only to the host cities in the United States but to a large segment of our retailers and manufacturers and others, who would be involved in carrying this out here in the United States.

There are a variety of host cities. They include: Washington, DC; East Rutherford, NJ; Orlando, FL; Foxborough, MA; Chicago, IL; Pontiac, MI; Pasadena and Palo Alto, CA; and finally, Dallas, TX. So this will have a very material economic impact in our country, radiating out from those cities, and obviously will be generally helpful to the national economy.

I should add that these soccer games are the most watched sporting event in the entire world, with an audience surpassing those who watch the Super Bowl, which of course is also a very popular sporting event. It would be a shame for the United States not to be able to celebrate such an event with commemorative coins. And of course the surcharges raised from U.S. and international sales would fund putting the games in the sponsoring cities and provide scholarships to amateur athletes.

All of these commemorative coin programs that I have just outlined, all five, are to be implemented at no net cost to the Government. These are self-financing initiatives, the way they are set up.

The sticking point on the House side during both conferences has been the inclusion on the Senate side of the Coin Redesign Act. That is a proposal to take and undertake a redesign of some of the basic coins that are generally in circulation in our country.

I certainly know, and it is well known by my colleagues, that Senator

CRANSTON has worked tirelessly to persuade House Members of the merits of coin redesign. I have voted for this legislation twice now in the past.

Senator CRANSTON has made many compromises to this legislation to assure everyone that some of the mistaken notions that were circulating were answered directly. For example, there is an assurance that the eagle will not be taken off any coins, nor will the phrase "In God We Trust." There were rumors circulating to that effect in the past. He has addressed those issues.

I commend his efforts to work with Members of both the House and the Senate to accommodate concerns, those and others that have been expressed, with regard to coin redesign. However, despite the fact that some of us are supportive of that effort, the House has twice acted to reject the coin redesign portion of this legislation.

It is my view, without in any way prejudicing Senator CRANSTON's strongly held position, that we do now need at this time to proceed with these other commemorative coins. I say that because time truly is of the essence. I do not think we can allow these other coin programs to suffer.

The Acting Director of the Mint has written to Senators MITCHELL and DOLE just this past April 8 urging expeditious passage of the conference report to H.R. 3337 because of two particularly time-sensitive commemorative coin programs in the bill. These are the 1992 White House Commemorative Coins Act and the 1992 Christopher Columbus Commemorative Coins Act. Lead time is required by the mint to select designs, produce dies, conduct trial strikes—as they are called in the early stage of the minting process—before these programs can be implemented.

According to Mr. Essner, "If enactment is not forthcoming very soon, the mint will be severely limited in its ability to fully produce and market these coins."

Another provision in this bill, the 1994 World Cup Games commemorative coins, will suffer if not enacted very soon. It is hoped that the sales of the World Cup coins could be advertised when ticket sales for the soccer games actually begin this July.

Again, sufficient lead time is required to design the coins in order for solicitations to be included in ticket sales.

Surcharges from the James Madison commemorative coin sales would enable the James Madison Fellowship Program to fund scholarships for at least one eligible person in each and every one of the 50 States. However, because of the coin's limited selling period, even this program could be in jeopardy if we do not act now.

Therefore, I do urge my colleagues to pass the conference report on H.R. 3337 before us.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the letter from Mr. Essner that I have just cited.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
U.S. MINT,
Washington, DC, April 8, 1992.

Hon. GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: This is to request your assistance in obtaining expeditious passage of H.R. 3337, the "1992 White House Commemorative Coin Act." There are two time-sensitive commemorative coin provisions in the bill (1992 programs) that require your immediate attention. It is our understanding that there is broad support for this measure in both Houses.

The White House Commemorative Coin provision and the Columbus Commemorative Coin provision both provide for 1992 programs. Therefore, lead-time is required by the Mint to select designs, produce dies, conduct trial strikes, procure presentation boxes, etc. If enactment is not forthcoming very soon, the Mint will be severely limited in its ability to fully produce and market these coins. These programs are self-sufficient and the bills provide that the programs will result in no net costs to the Government.

Furthermore, by not passing H.R. 3337, recipient organizations will be denied the potential to receive significant revenues in surcharges.

Sincerely,

EUGENE H. ESSNER,
Acting Director of the Mint.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, second, I want to read into the RECORD a second letter sent to GEORGE MITCHELL as majority leader dated April 15 of this year on this subject. This letter, I might say, is signed by the majority leader of the House, RICHARD GEPHARDT, by the majority whip, DAVID BONIER, and by the chairman of the subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House, ESTEBAN TORRES. The letter reads as follows:

On April 8, 1992, the House agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 3337, the Omnibus Commemorative Act of 1992 by a vote of 414–0. As you are aware, this vote on the conference report came after an intense struggle and two votes in the House in which an amendment to redesign the "tail" of our circulating coinage was rejected.

While the first vote may have been influenced by rumor and innuendo, the inaccuracy that characterized the debate was largely absent prior to the second vote. Moreover, the second vote was a rejection of a compromise redesign proposal that had been sharply limited. The second vote on this compromise clearly demonstrated the unwillingness of the House to approve coin redesign in any form.

We worked hard, as did the sponsor of the amendment, Senator Cranston, to get the House to accept the provision. In fact, all the outside interest groups whose bills were part of this package also worked hard to convince House members to support the redesign provision. Unfortunately, a majority of the House, on two occasions, rejected our views and the House and Senate conferees agreed to drop the redesign provision in order to expedite passage of the remainder of the package which is time sensitive.

Two of the programs included in H.R. 3337, The Christopher Columbus Quincentenary and the White House Commemorative Coin Act, are 1992 programs. The U.S. Mint has indicated that "If enactment is not forthcoming very soon, the Mint will be severely limited in its ability to fully produce and market these coins."

It is our judgment that despite our best efforts, a majority of the House will not support the redesign provision as part of this package. We believe that any efforts to reopen the conference will only serve to further delay passage of the time sensitive bills in the package and will effectively kill the legislation for this year.

Again, signed sincerely, GEPHARDT, BONIOR, and TORRES, the three leaders in the House just cited.

Mr. President, let me say that I know there will be Members coming over to speak. I have indications that Senator GRAHAM of Florida, Senator BOND, Senator HATCH, the Presiding Officer himself—Senator BRYAN—and possibly others are intending to make comments in the course of the time that is set aside this morning for debate on this conference report. I know, of course, Senator CRANSTON, who is on the floor, will want to address this issue. In view of that, Mr. President, I have finished my opening comments. I am prepared to either yield time to Senator CRANSTON, should he wish to speak now, or I will otherwise put in a quorum call and await speakers.

Mr. CRANSTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] is recognized. As the Chair understands the previous order, the Senator from California controls time in his own right. Is the Chair correctly informed?

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Presiding Officer. Mr. President, I have quite a few remarks to make on the matter now before us. Before doing so I would like to suggest the absence of a quorum so I can speak briefly to a Senator who just came on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRANSTON. I will delay the remarks I was about to make and some questions that I intended first to pose to the chairman of our committee, Senator RIEGLE, in order to permit Senator ROTH to speak on another matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair is correctly informed, is there a unanimous-consent agreement to set aside the matter that is presently before us, or is this to be charged to the distinguished Senator from California?

Mr. CRANSTON. That is fine. I accept that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the Chair. I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from California for his assistance.

NATIONAL BOXING CORPORATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, on February 8, 1992, David Tiberi fought James Toney for the International Boxing Federation middleweight title in Atlantic City. I, along with thousands of others, watched that fight on national television.

Tiberi was not expected to win against Toney, who was the reigning middleweight champion. Tiberi was a true underdog. But someone forgot to tell Dave Tiberi that he could not beat the reigning champion. Those who watched the fight saw an incredible performance by the underdog Tiberi. It was hard not to get caught up in the excitement as Tiberi, a native of Delaware, fought the fight of his life.

What happened next was shocking to say the least. In a split decision, Tiberi was judged to have lost the fight. I was outraged by this very questionable decision. I was not alone in my outrage. The ABC announcer pronounced the outcome, and I am quoting, "the most disgusting decision I've ever seen." Donald Trump, whose casino had sponsored the match, called the decision one of the worst he had ever seen.

My office received calls and letters from across the country expressing outrage.

After some initial inquiries, I found that despite the wide-ranging calls for an investigation, neither the New Jersey State Athletic Control Board nor the International Boxing Federation had chosen to investigate the match.

Shortly after the fight, I met with Dave Tiberi and his manager. After hearing Dave Tiberi tell his story, I decided that the February 8 fight had to be looked into. I directed my staff to fully investigate the matter.

What my staff found is contained in a report, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this report be placed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, this report documents how Dave Tiberi was a victim of a system where the regulated have been allowed to rule the regulators. This report also shows that, although the State of New Jersey appears to have a superficially adequate boxing regulatory structure, those regulations were not enforced in the Toney-Tiberi match.

For example, in apparent contravention of the New Jersey boxing rules, the judges who officiated at the Toney-Tiberi match were selected not by the body that regulates boxing in New Jersey, but by the IBF, a supposedly regulated organization. In fact, two of the judges officiated without a license to do so in New Jersey.

Moreover, one of the unlicensed judges scored two rounds for the champion, even though he believed the rounds were even, because of an IBF policy discouraging the scoring of even rounds and dictating that close rounds should be scored for the champion. This IBF policy is, however, contrary to the New Jersey boxing rules requiring that even rounds be scored evenly.

The referee who officiated at the match lacked experience and had been poorly evaluated in a previous fight. His penalizing of Tiberi for alleged low blows, and his failure to direct Toney to a neutral corner while Tiberi's gloves were being replaced—thereby giving Toney a 5-minute rest—were questionable exercises of a referee's discretion.

All of these facts, as well as a documented history of corruption in boxing in New Jersey, make it difficult to have faith in the fairness of the outcome of the Toney-Tiberi match.

As a U.S. Senator, I do not have the power to give Dave Tiberi the title that I believe he deserves. What I can and will do is send this report to the International Boxing Federation and the New Jersey Athletic Control Board, the two bodies who, in my opinion, should have done something about this matter a long time ago.

What I can also do is try to make sure such a travesty will not happen again.

Unfortunately the Toney-Tiberi fight is by no means an aberration of the world of professional boxing, a world where the real power often lies with private sanctioning bodies and promoters who operate on national and sometimes international levels. These promoters and sanctioning bodies take full advantage of a system where if the one state regulates too well, the promoters and sanctioning bodies will simply take their boxing matches, with their substantial revenues, to other jurisdictions that regulate less well.

Moreover, there have been repeated allegations of corruption and organized crime influence in professional boxing over the years. As the staff report indicates, allegations of such influences still exist.

I have become convinced that the only way to do anything about this situation is to establish a national body that will set and enforce rules and regulations for professional boxing. Such a body will insure fairness in professional boxing and protect the health and safety of boxers.

I, therefore, plan to introduce legislation to establish a nonprofit corporation to be known as the National Boxing Corporation that will be totally self-funding, thereby costing the taxpayer nothing.

My proposed National Boxing Corporation will not attempt to micromanage the sport of professional boxing. Nor will the National Boxing Corporation take the place of the currently existing state boxing commissions. But the National Boxing Corporation will establish a national data base to assist the State commissions. It will establish national rules and guidelines for professional boxing in this country to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the boxers and to guard against corruption and unfairness.

It is past time to eliminate corruption and unfairness in professional boxing. It is past time to effectively protect the health and welfare of professional boxers. It is past time to restore the public's confidence in boxing. It is time for a National Boxing Corporation. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT OF RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION—TIBERI V. TONEY

INTRODUCTION

On February 8, 1992, at the Taj Mahal's Mark G. Etess Arena in Atlantic City, New Jersey, David Tiberi of Delaware fought James Toney of Michigan for the International Boxing Federation (IBF) middleweight title. Tiberi, who at the time was the number 10 ranked IBF middleweight, was not favored to win against the reigning champion, Toney.

The match lasted the scheduled 12 rounds with neither fighter scoring a knockout. Toney was judged to be the winner by split decision. There was a wide discrepency in the scores of the judges, with judge Frank Brunette of New Jersey scoring the match 117–111 for Tiberi, judge Bill Lerch of Illinois scoring the match 116–111 for Toney and judge Frank Garza of Michigan scoring the match 115–112 for Toney.

The outcome produced widespread protest. The ABC announcer and boxing analyst, Alex Wallau, pronounced the outcome, "the most disgusting decision I've ever seen." The owner of the Taj Mahal, Donald Trump, was quoted by several newspapers as stating that the Toney-Tiberi decision was one of the worst he had ever seen.

Despite wide-ranging calls for an investigation, neither the New Jersey State Athletic Control Board (SACB) nor the IBF chose to investigate the match.

Citing his concern about the fairness and legitimacy of the Toney-Tiberi match, as well as concern about the integrity of boxing in general, Senator William V. Roth, Jr. directed his staff to look into the Toney-Tiberi title fight. Noting that the United States Congress has no authority to overturn or alter professional boxing decisions, Senator Roth nevertheless felt that the Toney-Tiberi fight, as well as general allegations of corruption in boxing, were a legitimate concern of Congress.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Dave Tiberi was, in several ways, a victim of a system where the regulated have been allowed to rule the regulators.

Although the State of New Jersey has what appears on paper to be an adequate boxing

regulatory structure, those regulations were not enforced in the Toney-Tiberi match.

In apparent contravention of New Jersey boxing regulations, the judges who officiated at the Toney-Tiberi fight were selected by the IBF. Two of the three judges officiated without a license to judge, or in anyway participate in, professional boxing in New Jersey. These two out-of-state judges were not knowledgeable about New Jersey boxing rules and, in fact, were under the impression that only the IBF rules were in effect during the Toney-Tiberi fight. Moreover, one of the unlicensed judges advised that two of the rounds which he in fact judged to be even rounds, he actually scored for Toney because of his understanding that the IBF rules do not permit the scoring of even rounds and that, in championship fights, it is IBF policy that even rounds are to be scored in favor of the champion.

The referee who officiated at the Toney-Tiberi fight lacked any experience in refereeing world championship fights. He was selected as a referee despite having been poorly evaluated for his performance in a previous fight. His penalizing of Tiberi for alleged low blows, and his failure to direct Toney to a neutral corner while Tiberi's gloves were being replaced were questionable exercises of a referee's discretion.

The lax enforcement of licensing requirements by New Jersey boxing authorities and their deference to private sanctioning bodies, and the failure of either New Jersey boxing authorities or IBF authorities to investigate the Toney-Tiberi match, combined with a documented history of corruption in boxing in New Jersey, make it difficult to have faith in the fairness of the outcome of the Toney-Tiberi match. In professional boxing today, the real power too often lies not with the state regulators, but with the sanctioning bodies and promoters who operate on a national and sometimes international level. If the regulators regulate too well, the sanctioning bodies and promoters can take boxing matches, with their substantial revenues, to other jurisdictions that regulate less well.

Background

In late fall of 1991, representatives of ABC Sports and Top Rank, Inc., a company that promotes professional boxing, began discussing the possibility of a televised professional boxing match. ABC's primary requirement was that the match be a title fight. Boxing promoter Bob Arum, president of Top Rank Inc., suggested that an IBF middleweight title defense by the reigning champion James Toney would be appropriate.[1]

Top Rank's east coast matchmaker, Ron Katz, advised that he selected Dave Tiberi as a suitable challenger for James Toney, due to Tiberi's boxing style and career history. (As the name implies, the job of boxing matchmaker is to determine suitable boxing components.) Katz asserts that the IBF was not involved in his initial selection of a challenger for the IBF title fight.

In early December, Katz approached Toney's manager, Jackie Kallen, with the suggestion that Tiberi challenge Toney for the IBF middleweight title in Atlantic City in February. Kallen agreed to the fight. Katz then approached Tiberi's manager, Mark Kondrath, who also agreed to the proposed fight. The boxers and their managers signed bout agreements with Top Rank, obligating them to fight one another on February 8, 1992.[2]

The agreement stated that Tiberi would be paid $22,500 plus $3,500 training expenses. The agreement also obligated Tiberi to grant the promotion rights for four championship defenses, if he were to obtain the title, to Top Rank. Toney agreed to compensation of $90,000 plus $10,000 in training expenses.[3]

The promoter, Top Rank, was responsible for raising the money to finance the match and for selling the match to the public through ticket and media related sales. Much of the local promotion for the match was handled by Atlantic City boxing promoter Frank Gelb of Frank Gelb Productions.

Scope of investigation

Persons Interviewed

In the course of its investigation, the staff sought to interview all relevant individuals and to review all relevant documents and materials.

Staff along with Senator Roth, interviewed Dave Tiberi and his manager Mark Kondrath. Staff also interviewed James Toney's manager Jackie Kallen.

Staff also met with officials from the New Jersey State Athletic Control Board (SACB), including Commissioner Larry Hazzard, Sr., and Gary Shaw, an SABC board member. Hazzard and Shaw were both present at the Toney-Tiberi fight. Hazzard, in addition to observing the match, was present in his official capacity. Staff also conducted a separate interview of the SACB Chairman, Charles Gromly, who was also present at the Toney-Tiberi match.

Representatives of the IBF were interviewed at IBF headquarters in East Orange, New Jersey, including Robert W. Lee, the founder and current president of the IBF, and his executive assistant Marian Muhammad. Ms. Muhammad served as the IBF supervisor at the Toney-Tiberi match. Lee was also present at the match.

Staff also interviewed at length all three of the judges of the match, including Frank Brunette of New Jersey, Frank Garza of Michigan and Bill Lerch of Illinois. Robert Palmer, the New Jersey referee who referred the match, was also interviewed.

Staff also attempted to contact each of the 12 SACB inspectors assigned to the fight on February 8th. The chief inspector was Sylvester Cuyler. Inspector Robert Levy was assigned to the Toney corner and Inspectors Robert Kimbrough and Fred Johnson were assigned to the Tiberi corner.[4] All of the inspectors were assigned by the SACB and are from New Jersey.

Staff spoke with the promoter Bob Arum who is president of Top Rank, Inc. Staff also spoke with Ron Katz, the Top Rank matchmaker responsible for selecting Tiberi as a challenger for Toney and Frank Gelb, the local promoter of the Toney-Tiberi fight. Finally, staff also interviewed a variety of other individuals knowledgeable about boxing in general.

Documents and Materials Reviewed

Staff requested and reviewed all relevant documents and materials relating to the match. No parties refused to provide any requested documents. These documents included copies of the original score cards, the agreements between the boxers and the promoter (bout agreements), the rules and regulations of the IBF and SACB as well as correspondence from the IBF to its judges regarding scoring. We were, however, unable to locate the first set of boxing gloves worn by Dave Tiberi that were replaced in the 6th round after tearing.

SELECTION AND PERFORMANCE OF THE FIGHT OFFICIALS

New Jersey boxing regulations prohibit any one from participating in boxing bouts in the state without first having obtained a license from the State Athletic Commissioner.[5] The regulations further provide that boxing judges "shall be selected, licensed and assigned by the Commissioner".[6]

In apparent contravention of New Jersey regulations, the three judges who officiated at the Toney-Tiberi fight were selected by the IBF and two of the three judges officiated without a license to judge, or in any way participate, in professional boxing in New Jersey. These two out-of-state judges were unfamiliar with New Jersey boxing rules and, in fact, were under the impression that only the IBF rules were in effect during the Toney-Tiberi fight. Moreover, one of the unlicensed judges advised that two of the rounds which he believed to be even rounds, he actually scored for Toney because of his understanding that IBF policy does not permit the scoring of even rounds and that, in championship fights, it is IBF policy that even rounds are to be scored in favor of the champion. This is in contrast to the New Jersey judge who judged, and scored, one even round.

The referee who officiated at the Toney-Tiberi fight lacked any experience in refereeing world championship fights. He was selected as a referee despite having been poorly evaluated for his performance in a previous fight. His penalizing of Tiberi for alleged low blows, and his failure to direct Toney to a neutral corner while Tiberi's gloves were being replaced are questionable exercises of a referee's discretion.

In New Jersey, professional boxing matches are scored by three judges. Under New Jersey rules, the referee is deemed the "chief ring official." The referee does not score the fight, but can penalize a fighter by imposing scoring penalties, and has the authority to stop a fight. Each boxing match is

[1] Through a previously signed "bout agreement" James Toney was contractually obligated to fight a number of Top Rank promoted fights.

[2] At the time of the December negotiations, Tiberi was the middleweight champion of the Florida-based International Boxing Council (IBC). In order to challenge Toney for the IBF middleweight title, Tiberi had to be ranked by the IBF. Although previously ranked number 10 by the IBF, Tiberi had lost his ranking after being ranked number one by the IBC. The IBF policy is to refuse to rank a boxer ranked by the IBC. In order to be ranked by the IBF, and to be eligible to challenge Toney for the IBF middleweight title, the IBF requested that Tiberi relinquish his IBC title. Tiberi relinquished his IBC title in December 1991 and communicated that fact to the IBF. The IBF then reevaluated Tiberi's record and returned him to his previous IBF ranking of number 10. The IBC is one of several small, lesser-known sanctioning bodies. The most well-known sanctioning bodies are the World Boxing Council (WBC), headquartered in Mexico, the International Boxing Federation (IBF), headquartered in New Jersey, and the World Boxing Association (WBA) headquartered in Venezuela.

[3] A footnote to the bout agreement stated that Toney and Top Rank had previously executed a title defense agreement and that that agreement remained in full force and effect. The footnote went on to state that the Toney-Tiberi match shall not constitute a title defense as referred to in the previous agreement. The footnote concluded by stating that Top Rank shall have the rights in two remaining title defenses, the first having been utilized in connection with Toney's 12/13/91 bout against Mike McCallum.

[4] Although the SACB typically assigns two inspectors per boxer, the SACB has no records, and no one at the SACB has any memory of whether or not if a second inspector was assigned to Toney.

[5] S. 13.45–8(a), New Jersey Administrative Code.

[6] S. 13.46–41, New Jersey Administrative Code.

also supervised by a number of boxing inspectors. At least four inspectors are assigned to a given fight with two inspectors assigned to each fighter. The inspectors are present in the locker room before the fight and in the boxer's corner during the bout. Inspectors are also present at the pre-fight weigh-in as well as when the gloves are selected. The inspectors watch for rule violations and equipment failures such as torn gloves.

New Jersey rules do not delineate any criteria for how officials should be chosen for an individual boxing match, but does provide that they must be selected, licensed and assigned by the Commissioner.

Selection process

Although New Jersey rules require that the Commissioner of the SACB select the officials for a boxing match, in the case of title fights involving a sanctioning body such as the IBF, the New Jersey SACB Commissioner has generally deferred to the sanctioning body in the selection of fight officials. Commissioner Hazzard indicated in an interview that sanctioning bodies are permitted to select two of the three judges but that the remaining officials are selected by the SACB. However, IBF Commissioner Bob Lee said it is extremely rare for the New Jersey SACB to override IBF selection of fight officials.

For the Toney-Tiberi match, IBF president Bob Lee selected Frank Brunette, Bill Lerch and Frank Garza as the judges and Randy Newman as referee. While accepting the judges, Commissioner Hazzard did not accept Randy Newman but instead chose Robert Palmer as the referee. Hazzard offered no reason for selecting Robert Palmer other than the fact that Hazzard felt it was time to give Palmer a chance.

IBF President Lee stated that he selected Lerch and Garza for no particular reason except that, according to Lee, they were well respected judges and that it was their turn to judge a title fight. Lee flatly denied that Lerch and Garza were selected because they are from the Midwest, as is Toney. Lee said that it is a coincidence that these two judges were from the same region of the country, and one from the same state, as the reigning champion.[7]

Commissioner Hazzard and Bob Lee both deny that anyone representing Toney or Top Rank had any input in the selection of the officials. Toney's manager, Jackie Kallen, and representatives of Top Rank also denied any input in the selection of officials. Both Lee and Hazzard told staff that it would be wrong for a boxer or his representatives to have any input in the selection of officials. Both Lee and Hazzard did acknowledge, however, that a boxer or his representatives do occasionally object to a particular official. No one reported having made or received any such objection regarding officials involved in the Toney-Tiberi match.

Lerch and Garza each told staff that they are not licensed, and have never been licensed, to judge boxing in New Jersey. Garza stated that the Toney-Tiberi match was the first and only match he has judged in New Jersey. At the rules meeting prior to the match, he asked the IBF supervisor, Marian Muhammad, whether he needed to obtain a New Jersey license to judge the Toney-Tiberi match. Garza has been required to be licensed, or at least present his Michigan license, in other states in which he has officiated except in Colorado which does not have a state boxing commission. According to Garza, Muhammad replied that she did not think Garza needed a New Jersey license but that she would check. Garza was never asked to present his Michigan license. Although Garza had never judged Tiberi, he had judged Toney on several previous occasions.

The Toney-Tiberi match was the first match that Lerch had judged in New Jersey. Lerch stated that he did not ask anyone if he needed a New Jersey license and no one said anything to him about the matter. This was the first time that Lerch had judged either Toney or Tiberi.

The staff requested from the SACB a copy of the license for each individual involved in the Toney-Tiberi match. The SACB produced a current license for each relevant individual, except Garza and Lerch. Commissioner Hazzard subsequently asserted that Garza and Lerch did not have to be licensed in New Jersey since they were licensed in their home states and by the IBF. However, this assertion seems contrary to the requirements of New Jersey boxing regulations. In any event, there was no effort by the SACB to confirm that these officials were indeed licensed in their home states. The SACB appears to have deferred totally to the IBF in evaluating the qualifications and competence of the out of state judges.

The referee

As previously mentioned, SACB Commissioner Hazzard selected Robert Palmer as the referee for the Toney-Tiberi match despite the fact that he had never before refereed a world championship fight.

While the New Jersey SACB does not systematically evaluate the boxing officials it licenses, the IBF does record the performance of its officials. After each IBF or USBA (the national affiliate of the IBF) sanctioned match, the IBF or USBA supervisor completes a "Referee and Judges Report."

A Referee and Judges Report regarding Robert Palmer, evaluating his performance at a December 12, 1991 match held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, noted that, "Palmer was put in at last minute and he did not perform on the level as our good officials do. It was a "personal" thing with the commission and the referee that was originally assigned. I wouldn't suggest him for one of our upcoming bouts no time soon. Green." Commissioner Hazzard stated he was unaware of the IBF's unfavorable review of Palmer's past performance when he designated Palmer as referee for the Toney-Tiberi match.

Low blow penalty

At the end of the 6th round, Referee Robert Palmer penalized Tiberi one point for low blows. It has been alleged that the penalty was uncalled for in that Tiberi was not given an appropriate warning prior to being penalized, or, even if Tiberi was warned, that Palmer erred in deducting a point due to Palmer's inexperience about procedures in world title fights.

Several individuals present at the match have stated that Palmer did in fact warn Tiberi about low blows and a review of the tape recording of the match confirms that a warning apparently was given. In any event, neither the New Jersey boxing rules nor the rules of the IBF require a referee to warn a boxer prior to deducting points for low blows, as is the case in amateur boxing.

The decision as to whether or not to deduct points for a low blow is within the sound discretion of the referee. However, most witnesses interviewed indicated that while warnings for low blows are not unusual in title fights, actual deduction of points is unusual unless the low blows are more egregious than they appeared to be in the Toney-Tiberi match.

Neutral corner dispute

There have been allegations that the referee acted unfairly when he allowed Toney to sit in his corner and receive assistance and coaching, instead of standing in a neutral corner, while Tiberi's torn gloves were being replaced. Neither the New Jersey nor the IBF rules specifically address where a boxer should go when his opponent's gloves are being inspected or changed.

It does, however, appear to be a general practice in professional boxing that when the action is stopped, at a time other than the normal time between rounds, the boxer or boxers are directed by the referee to neutral corners. In fact, the practice of sending a boxer to a neutral corner when the action stops is mandated by the rules in certain situations. For example, under the New Jersey boxing rules, when a boxer has fallen out of the ring, the other boxer must at once be ordered by the referee to a neutral corner. (N.J.A.C. 13:46–8.20)

It is clear from the videotape of the match as well as from reports of witnesses that Toney was allowed to rest by sitting in his own corner and receiving assistance from his handlers during the entire break in the action of approximately 5 minutes while Tiberi's gloves were being changed. In contrast, Tiberi was standing for the vast majority of this time.

Commissioner Hazzard stated that although there is no written rule that boxers must go to neutral corners when a boxer's gloves are being changed, it is often the practice to do so. Bob Lee of the IBF stated that sending a boxer to a neutral corner during such a break in action was within the discretion of the referee. Palmer, the referee, stated that his understanding of the rules is that a boxer should be sent to a neutral corner only when his opponent is knocked down. Palmer stated he did not understand it to be the practice to send a boxer to a neutral corner when the other boxer's gloves are being inspected or changed. However, in the 12th round, during a momentary break in the action while Tiberi's glove was being inspected due to a loose piece of tape, a review of the videotape indicates that Palmer did direct Toney to a neutral corner. When interviewed, Palmer did not recall whether he directed Toney to a neutral corner in the 12th round, but stated that he may have done so due to the short length of that break.

It was clearly beneficial for Toney to be allowed to sit and rest in his corner and receive assistance and coaching while Tiberi was having his gloves inspected and changed. By the 5th round, Toney appeared to be slowing down and, in fact, all three judges scored the 5th round for Tiberi. After his five-minute rest, Toney fought with more energy and, according to all three judges, won the 6th round.

OTHER ISSUES

Scoring

Professional boxing in New Jersey is scored on what is known as a "10 point must system." Under the 10 point must system, as delineated in the New Jersey Administrative Code (N.J.A.C.13:46–8.19), the judges must award the winner of any given round 10

[7] At the press conference after the match, Lee was asked why the three judges were not from New Jersey. Lee, while not directly answering the question, stated, "You have a fighter from Delaware and you have a fighter from Michigan and we have judges from all over the U.S. . . ." Lee's press conference statement at least implies that geography was a factor considered in the selection of the judges.

points. The loser is awarded some score less than 10 points. If a boxer is slightly superior to his opponent in any given round, the winner must receive 10 points and the loser must receive 9 points. If a boxer wins a round decisively, he must receive 10 points and his opponent must receive 8. A boxer can be awarded as low as 7 points if he is knocked down during a round. When a boxer is penalized by the referee, a point is deducted from the penalized boxer's score. If neither boxer can be judged the winner of a round, 10 points must be scored for each boxer.

At the conclusion of each round, the judges submit their scorecards to the commissioner or his representative. Judges are not permitted to maintain a running tabulation of their score and scores are not announced after each round. At the conclusion of the bout, the points are tallied by the Commissioner or his representative. At the Toney-Tiberi bout, it appears that Lawrence Wallace, an assistant to Commissioner Hazzard, tallied the score cards as did Marian Muhammad, the IBF supervisor for the bout. Muhammad appears to have been the one to physically collect the score cards after each round.

The New Jersey boxing code does not address what specific factors a judge must consider when scoring. However, the *practice* in New Jersey, as well as boxing in general, is that four factors are considered in scoring a boxing match. These four factors are: clean punches, effective aggressiveness, defense and ring generalship. Although these factors are not listed in the New Jersey boxing rules, Commissioner Hazzard told staff that the four factors are taught to New Jersey licensed officials in SACB training sessions. In addition, the official New Jersey SACB scoring card, lists the four scoring factors.[8]

The IBF has its own separate guidelines for scoring by judges.[9] It is important to note that, while there are many similarities, some differences do exist between the IBF guidelines and New Jersey state rules on scoring. For example, a single knockdown would likely result in a 10/7 score under New Jersey State rules while it would likely require multiple knock downs to result in a 10/7 score under IBF guidelines. More importantly, New Jersey rules require that "If neither boxer can be judged the winner of a round, 10 points must be scored for each boxer" (N.J.A.C. 12.46-8.19(b)(4)). In contrast, the IBF guidelines state that a judge "should very rarely have an even round, if ever. Challenger should be expected to take title from champion and not win by default."[10] This standard was emphasized in an IBF press release dated October, 1991 which stated that the scoring of even rounds "irks" IBF president Bob Lee. The release quotes Lee as stating, "[w]e have endeavored to discourage the scoring of even rounds," and that "[t]his appears to be a cop-out by officials who are paid good money to perform their duties." According to Lee, when a round is extremely close the challenger must take the title from the champion—and scoring officials should bear that in mind when scoring IBF title fights.

In addition to being inconsistent with New Jersey regulations, which require that even rounds *must* be scored 10–10, the IBF antipathy to even rounds has been criticized by knowledgeable individuals in boxing as being very unfair to challengers.

One of the unlicensed out of state judges, Bill Lerch, told staff that he, in fact, judged two rounds of the fight to be even rounds, but scored these rounds for Toney because of his understanding that IBF rules did not permit the scoring of even rounds in championship fights. These rounds were the 2nd and 12th rounds, according to Lerch. The other out of state judge, Frank Garza, while not conceding that he mistakenly scored any rounds in the Toney-Tiberi match, did state that he had scored only one even round in all of his career as a professional boxing judge.[11] The New Jersey licensed judge, Frank Brunette, did judge and score one round (the 10th round) even. It appears that New Jersey licensed judge followed New Jersey rules on scoring of even rounds, while the unlicensed out of state judges followed IBF rules instead.

Torn gloves

During the 6th round of the match, referee Palmer stopped the fight for approximately five minutes so that Tiberi's gloves could be replaced. Palmer stated that one of the corner inspectors first noticed that one of Tiberi's gloves had torn and notified him of this fact. After inspecting the torn glove, Palmer stopped the action and ordered the glove replaced. While the glove was being replaced Palmer noticed that Tiberi's other glove had a similar torn seam. Palmer ordered that glove replaced also.

The two torn gloves raised suspicions for two reasons. First, everyone interviewed agrees that it is highly unusual for two gloves to tear at about the same time. Several experienced boxing officials stated that they had never seen two gloves, on the same boxer, tear during the same round. Second, due to Toney's apparent physical condition (he appeared to be tired and was treated for dehydration after the fight), it has been suggested that the gloves tore at a time in the fight particularly fortuitous for Toney, i.e., when he needed a rest.

Staff questioned those who were in any way involved with the gloves used in the Toney-Tiberi match. We found no witness with any evidence that the gloves had been tampered with. Staff was unable to locate and examine the actual gloves that were replaced so therefore cannot comment on the potentially useful physical evidence the actual gloves could have provided. Although the promoter was responsible for providing the gloves, no one assumed responsibility for doing anything with the gloves after the fight. In light of the controversy surrounding the match and the unusual nature of the two gloves tearing in the same round, it would have been prudent for the IBF or the SACB to have secured the damaged gloves.

There has been no investigation by the SACB, the IBF or Top Rank concerning the tearing of the gloves. At the post-match press conference, Bob Lee, president of the IBF, stated that Tiberi's gloves could have come from a "bad batch."

Tampering with boxing gloves for advantage of some type is not unheard of in boxing. Intentionally cutting gloves has allegedly been utilized in the past as a means to give a boxer a rest. Individuals knowledgeable about boxing, however, are of the opinion that it would be far more likely for a boxer to have his own glove torn or cut in order to get a rest. It would be logistically very difficult to arrange for an opponent's gloves to tear or rip at an opportune moment.[12]

At a pre-fight meeting, Tiberi and Toney each selected their gloves from four sets supplied by the promoter. Toney, because he was the reigning champion, was given first choice. After the boxers chose their gloves, they marked their gloves for identification and left them in the care of the promoter, or his representatives. The boxers were given their previously selected gloves shortly before the match.

No evidence of foul play regarding the damaged gloves was discovered. As previously stated, no mechanism has been suggested which would have caused Tiberi's gloves to split at an opportune time for Toney.

FAILURE OF IBF OR NEW JERSEY SACB TO INVESTIGATE THE TONEY V. TIBERI FIGHT

The two entities in the best position to investigate the Toney-Tiberi bout where, without doubt, the IBF and the SACB. The IBF and the SACB received numerous complaints and requests for an investigation of the Toney-Tiberi bout, yet neither conducted an investigation. The IBF and the SACB take the position that the bout did not, and does not, warrant an investigation of any type.

IBF president Bob Lee, nevertheless, felt that the fight was controversial enough to contact Bill Brennen, the chairman of the IBF championship committee, shortly after the fight. The Championship Committee determined that a mandatory rematch between Toney and Tiberi should be ordered. The IBF officially announced that a mandatory rematch had been ordered through a later press release. The effect of a mandatory rematch was that Toney would not be allowed to defend his title until he fought Tiberi a second time.

In addition to not investigating the Toney-Tiberi fight, the IBF publicly denounced any suggestion of an investigation and publicly pressured Tiberi to accept a rematch with Toney that was being offered by promoter Bob Arum of Top Rank. Sy Roseman, public relations director for the IBF was quoted as stating that "[s]omebody is awfully stupid in the Tiberi camp to turn down $125,000 . . ." in reference to Top Rank's offer to Tiberi for a rematch. (Wilmington News Journal, p. D-1, 2/13/92)

HISTORY OF BOXING CORRUPTION IN NEW JERSEY

A brief review of the history of past investigations of corrupt practices relating to boxing in New Jersey bears relevance to the current investigation. In February 1983, after reviewing a preliminary New Jersey State Police assessment of boxing in New Jersey, then Attorney General of New Jersey, Irwin I. Kimmelman, requested that the New Jer-

[8] New Jersey SACB scoring cards were not used in the Toney-Tiberi match. Instead, IBF scoring cards were used. These cards do not list the four factors and have no designated space for written comments, as do the New Jersey SACB scoring cards.

[9] These guidelines are set out in "IBF/USBA Ring Officials Guide and Medical Seminar Outline."

[10] IBF/USBA Ring Officials Guide, page 7.

[11] Garza told staff that "even" spelled backwards is "neve" and that is as close to "never" as possible without a flat rule that says there never will be an even round.

[12] The boxing gloves, as is the practice in professional boxing, were supplied by the promoter Top Rank. Top Rank supplied Mexican manufactured gloves with the brand name "Reyes." Although not as widely used as "Everlast" brand boxing gloves, Reyes brand gloves are sometimes used in professional boxing. At least one employee of Top Rank remembers that someone representing the Toney camp requested that Reyes gloves be supplied. Jackie Kallen, Toney's manager, stated that she could not recall if she requested a specific brand of glove for this match, but that she, and Toney, generally prefer Reyes gloves. Several of the inspectors at the fight stated that while Reyes gloves are of the same weight as Everlast gloves, Reyes gloves have a somewhat different weight distribution and have a reputation as "knock out" gloves which reputedly hard punchers such as Toney favor.

sey Commission of Investigation conduct an inquiry into the regulatory structure of professional boxing in New Jersey. At that time, boxing in New Jersey was experiencing rapid growth. The growth of boxing in New Jersey was due partly to the fact that Atlantic City gambling casinos were increasingly hosting boxing matches as a promotional device.

In an interim report released on March 1, 1984 (Interim Report), the Commission of Investigation concluded that the regulatory structure for boxing in New Jersey was inadequate. The Commission found that under the then existent regulatory structure, boxing contests could not be conducted in New Jersey without "breaking the law at worst or bending the rules at best . . ." (Interim Report at p. 1). The Commission found that the Office of State Athletic Commissioner (OSAC), the predecessor agency to the SACB, was either unwilling or unable to obey the law pertaining to professional boxing in New Jersey (Interim Report at p. 12). Many of the problems uncovered by the Commission on Investigation stemmed from the OSAC's extremely lax licensing practices (Interim Report at p. 1).

The Commission on Investigation's Interim Report recommended substantial changes to the regulatory structure of boxing in New Jersey. By January 7, 1985, a law was enacted to improve tax procedures and collections relating to boxing and, by March 15, 1985, a more comprehensive statute was enacted to impose more stringent regulatory controls on boxing in New Jersey. In the case of the Toney-Tiberi match, however, the regulatory controls were not always enforced by the SACB.

In 1985, the Commission of Investigation released its final report entitled "Organized Crime in Boxing." The Commission's final report details the substantial intrusion of organized crime members and associates into boxing in New Jersey. The Commission concluded that its report documented the presence of organized crime in boxing to an extent that warranted aggressive official reaction. For these and other reasons, the Commission recommended that boxing in New Jersey be banned, or in the alternative, that a program of reforms be implemented. It is significant to note that New Jersey's current SACB Commission advised staff that the SACB was primarily concerned with the safety and welfare of boxers and was not, in his view, responsible for controlling organized crime influence in boxing. The SACB sometimes does background checks on applicants for licenses, but only on rare occasions.

The FBI's "Crown Royal" investigation in the mid-1980s of corruption in professional boxing also touched on New Jersey, according to former FBI agent Joseph Spinelli.

At the time of the Crown Royal investigation, IBF president Bob Lee was deputy commissioner to then New Jersey boxing commissioner Joe Walcott. Spinelli maintains that Lee received a $3,000 payment for Walcott from an individual seeking a New Jersey promoter's license. Walcott and Lee are also alleged to have later received $1,000 each in connection with the promoter's license.

Walcott has denied receiving any payments from individuals involved in the Crown Royal investigation. Although Lee denies receiving the $3,000 payment for Walcott, he admits to receiving $1,000 from one of the Crown Royal participants. Lee maintains, however, that the payment was to help finance his unsuccessful 1982 campaign for the presidency of the World Boxing Association.

During the later part of 1990, the New Jersey Attorney General's office referred an investigation to the New Jersey Ethics Commission regarding an allegation that state officials involved in boxing had been receiving complimentary tickets to professional boxing matches. The Ethics Commission concluded that several state officials, including current SACB Commissioner, Larry Hazzard, his deputy Lawrence Wallace and the SACB's chief inspector, Sylvester Cuyler, had received numerous complimentary tickets from several promoters. Under New Jersey law it is illegal for a regulator to take anything of value from those regulated.

Hazzard, Wallace, Cuyler and several other SACB employees admitted to receiving complimentary tickets from promoters, and they agreed to pay $3,500, $1,500 and $150, respectively, into the state's general fund. The Ethics Commission did not pursue the investigation further.

The New Jersey Public Advocates Office is currently investigating complaints involving the renewal of licenses for certain New Jersey boxing officials. At this time there appears to be no formal review and appeal process for New Jersey boxing officials who are denied license renewal.

GENERAL PROBLEMS IN BOXING

This inquiry, in addition to uncovering specific problems regarding the Toney-Tiberi fight, also has revealed other more broad-based, systemic problems affecting professional boxing. Generally, these problems can be characterized as: exploitation of boxers; conflicts of interest; questionable judging; and organized crime influence. Taken together, these situations endanger the health, safety and welfare of boxers and undermine the sport's credibility in the public eye.

Exploitation of boxers

Boxers generally enjoy few, if any, of the protections and benefits accorded other professional athletes, e.g., health insurance coverage, pension plans, etc. While some experts estimate the number of professional boxers to be approximately 10,000, it is a universe which is difficult to establish with any certainty. What is obvious, however, is that for every boxer who steps into the spotlight in Atlantic City or Las Vegas for a multi-million dollar title fight, there exists a multitude of fighters scrounging to make a living on the club fight circuit, often times sacrificing their well-being in the process.

Exploitation in boxing occurs on a number of different levels. For example, a fighter usually has a manager, who is responsible for handling the boxer's business affairs, particularly negotiating fight deals with boxing promoters. In those negotiations, the manager and the promoter should maintain an arms-length, adversarial relationship, with the manager being responsible for the fighter's best interests. However, we received allegations that one of boxing's major promoters often requires fighters to agree to use his son as their manager in order for the promoter to handle their fights, creating an obvious conflict of interest.

It is also not unusual for a promoter to have long-term, option contracts with both fighters in a bout, meaning that the promoter comes out on top no matter who wins the fight. A small number of promoters basically control professional boxing. This oligopoly gives boxers very few options as they try to fight their way to the top; either the boxer plays the game according to the rules set by these promoters or he is denied the opportunity to advance. As a result, many fighters agree to sign these option contracts or agree to other onerous conditions because the boxer sees it as his only chance to have a legitimate shot at success.

Once a promoter and a manager are able to "tie up" a fighter under such an arrangement, there are many other ways these unscrupulous individuals are able to take advantage of the boxer. Duplicate contracts may be used wherein, for example, one contract is presented to the state athletic commission in which the percentage paid to the manager is consistent with the amount allowed by that state's regulations; however, the manager maintains a separate contract with the boxer in which the manager takes a higher percentage than the law allows. Also, most boxers are able to make arrangements to train at a resort hotel at no charge in exchange for the publicity their presence will bring to the resort. Promoters, however, may require a fighter under contract to them to train at the promoters training camp, while charging the fighter excessively for the privilege.

Another example of how professional boxing currently exploits fighters lies in the mismatches which promoters arrange between boxers of different skill levels. Mismatches occur partly because no central repository exists to verify the won-loss records of fighters, which permits the manipulation of fighters' records and rankings by the various sanctioning bodies. Often, mismatches are arranged to pad the record and hence the value of a fighter who a promoter considers to be a hot property. The promoter will arrange a fight between his hot fighter and a fighter of inferior skills, with the promoter often misrepresenting the record of the inferior fighter in order to have the fight appear as if it will be a competitive bout. In addition to being potentially fraudulent, mismatches can result in a potentially dangerous situation for the less skilled fighter, who is stepping into the ring with a boxer far his superior. We also heard allegations that there are certain individuals who run what are called "meat factories" which specialize in providing opponents for boxing cards all over the country. Often these boxers are not particularly skilled and are provided with the understanding that they will lose the fight.

Perhaps the worst example of such a mismatch occurred in 1983 when Korean boxer Deuk-Koo Kim, fighting in the U.S., was killed in the ring in a nationally televised bout. Kim was rated by the World Boxing Association (WBA) as the top contender for then-champion Ray Mancini's title. However, Kim was was not even rated in the top ten by any of Ring Magazine's (the so-called "bible of boxing") 50 experts, two of whom were Korean. Further, when Ring contacted the Korean Sports Federation (the government agency which supervises sports, including boxing, in Korea), to obtain a list of that country's top 40 fighters for the magazine's annual record book, Kim was not among them.

Boxing's many problems are fostered by the patchwork system of state regulation currently governing professional boxing. Forty-two states and the District of Columbia currently regulate or license boxing. In Kansas, North Carolina, Nebraska and Oregon (Portland only), city governments are authorized to assume that role. There is no governmental regulation of boxing in Colorado, Oklahoma, South Dakota or Wyoming.

Each state that regulates boxing has its own regulatory structure, usually consisting of a state athletic commission whose members are political appointees. The commission then establishes that state's rules and licensing requirements. It came as no surprise when we were told that the regulations

vary widely from state-to-state, as does enforcement of those regulations. For example, many states have rules which automatically suspend a boxer from fighting for anywhere from 45 to 90 days after he has been knocked out. For most fighters who are barely making a living, this amounts to being laid off without pay. Faced with that situation, boxers have been known to move to a neighboring state with less stringent regulations or else a boxer might simply fight under a different name. In one case, a fighter was found to have boxed despite having a heart pacemaker.

In addition, the national and international nature of professional boxing further diminishes the effectiveness of state regulation. Although most of the top professional boxers are American and most major fights are held in this country, the WBA and the WBC, two of the three leading sanctioning bodies in professional boxing, are based in Venezuela and Mexico, respectively. The WBA, in various forms, dates back to 1921, while the WBC was founded in 1963. The proliferation of these so-called "alphabet soup" organizations has resulted in a five-fold increase in the number of world boxing championships (from eight to more than 40) since each group establishes its own weight classes, title holders, and rankings of contenders. Accordingly, each sanctioning body also establishes and enforces its own regulations and plays a major role in selecting the judges and referees for its fights.

In exchange for sanctioning world title fights under their respective auspices, these sanctioning bodies require that fighters and promoters pay sanctioning fees, with the boxers' fees coming out of their purses for the fight. These sanctioning fees are either set as a percentage of the receipts or are negotiated as a fixed amount, which have been as high as $250,000 per fighter. We were informed that all of the services and costs necessary to stage a professional title fight are borne by the promoter and the state boxing commission where the bout is held and not by the sanctioning organization. As such, it is unclear what services these sanctioning bodies provide in exchange for these large sanctioning fees which they require boxers to pay.

Conflicts of interest

We received allegations that conflict of interest situations occur repeatedly in professional boxing, often to the disadvantage of the fighter. One of the worst examples is the situation described above where a promoter requires a fighter to use his son as his manager. Arguably, in that scenario, in the negotiations between the father/promoter and the son/manager, the manager's best interests may be at odds with those of the fighter whom he should be representing. Other of the exploitation examples described above similarly result from the conflicts inherent in these arrangements.

Another conflict of interest situation involves the system of state regulation of boxing. There appears to be an inherent conflict of interest in the mission of the state boxing commissions. On the one hand, these bodies are charged with attracting boxing to their state, promoting the sport and maximizing income to the state from these bouts. On the other hand, these organizations are also charged with regulating the sport in that state and protecting the boxers who fight there. That creates a tension wherein strict enforcement might lead the promoter to take the fight to a neighboring state which might be less restrictive thus resulting in lost revenue to the stricter state. On the whole, there appears to be little incentive for states to strictly regulate professional boxing.

Questionable judging

By its very nature, judging the outcome of a boxing match is a highly subjective exercise. Thus, in order for the sport to maintain its credibility with the public, it is essential that those individuals who determine the outcome of these bouts maintain the highest level of skill and competence. The system of state regulation does not always lend itself to the uniform application of that standard. Some states require judges and referees to be licensed in that state in order to officiate a fight there, while others may waive their own licensing requirements for officials licensed in other states, and there are other states with no licensing requirements at all. This situation is further complicated by the presence of the international sanctioning bodies which use their own officials for certain fights. Although many of those are also state licensed, some of those officials come from foreign countries. As a result, the skill level of boxing officials varies greatly.

Organized crime influence

Our inquiry has also produced allegations of organized crime influence in professional boxing, primarily on the part of La Cosa Nostra (LCN). New Jersey is one of five states where 85 percent of all American boxing matches occur. From 1983–1985, primarily because New Jersey was becoming a boxing center as a result of the Atlantic City casinos, the New Jersey Commission of Investigation conducted what perhaps is the most extensive inquiry to date into professional boxing. This investigation uncovered evidence of widespread corruption and organized crime influence in professional boxing.

Further, in the early 1980s, the FBI conducted an investigation titled Crown Royal, which uncovered links between Don King, who is probably boxing's most powerful promoter, and organized crime members. Although the investigation was shutdown prior to its completion, undercover FBI agents met with King and agreed to co-promote professional boxing matches. The meeting with King was arranged for the undercover agents through Michael Franzese, then a capo in the Colombo family, and the Reverend Al Sharpton, who allegedly had ties to the Gambino family.

Gambling, both legal and illegal, is widespread in professional boxing and organized crime allegedly uses its ties to promoters and other boxing officials in order to find out which fighter to bet on in particular fights. Organized crime figures also are alleged to "own" certain fighters. In those situations, organized crime makes money not only by controlling the outcome of their boxers' fights, but also by getting a percentage of the boxers' earnings.

We also heard allegations that organized crime profits from professional boxing through controlling the closed-circuit rights to major fights. Again, obtaining these rights is made easier by organized crime's connections with key promoters. Closed-circuit rights involve controlling the venues, generally movie theaters and arenas, in a particular geographic area which will be showing a particular fight. This is exactly the kind of activity most favored by organized crime because it is a lucrative cash payday since most people pay for their tickets in cash. As such, there is no paper trail to be concerned with in dividing the receipts.

Other alleged examples of organized crime influence in professional boxing include bribes paid to state boxing commission officials and fighters taking "dives," i.e., being instructed to purposely lose a particular fight.

CONCLUSION

Our investigation of the Toney-Tiberi match raises serious issues about the current status of professional boxing in the United States. Other, more generalized allegations about problems associated with professional boxing, including organized crime influence, conflicts of interest and gross exploitation of boxers, deserve further investigation and consideration.

WHITE HOUSE COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KOHL). The senior Senator from California is recognized, and controls 45 minutes.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, may I address some questions to the chairman of the Banking Committee? I am glad that he is returning to the floor.

I appreciate the opportunity to address some questions to my friend, the chairman of the Banking Committee.

First, he said, I believe, that he has voted for coin redesign at least twice and he supports coin redesign except under the present circumstances that affect this particular conference report at this particular time.

Mr. RIEGLE. That is correct.

Mr. CRANSTON. Is it true that the Banking Committee has reported coin redesign unanimously several times?

Mr. RIEGLE. That also is correct.

Mr. CRANSTON. Is it true that the Senate has passed the measure calling for coin redesign a good many times unanimously without any vote or speech against it?

Mr. RIEGLE. I know of no vote or speech against it, and it certainly has passed the Senate.

Mr. CRANSTON. The fact is that it has happened 13 times now.

Is the Senator also aware that the coin redesign measure makes very substantial money for the U.S. Treasury, moneys that would go to reduce the national debt, in contrast to the commemorative coins which do not make any significant money for the Treasury?

Mr. RIEGLE. On that point, the estimate that I think is the most reliable one indicates that the CBO has indicated that there would be a savings, therefore additional revenue to the Government, of about $358 million over a 6-year period based on a redesign of all five coins generally in circulation. There may be other estimates, but that one from CBO would certainly indicate that it would generate additional revenue for the Government, which, therefore, obviously would be available to reduce the deficit or for whatever other purpose.

Mr. CRANSTON. That is in contrast to the commemorative coins that are

in the conference report now before us that do not produce any substantial revenue, if any, for the Government.

Mr. RIEGLE. That is right. It would be fair to say, I think, that the commemorative coins have dedicated purposes. So they are designed to raise revenue, but it is to finance activities related to each purpose of those commemorative coins.

Mr. CRANSTON. That is my understanding. In regard to the amount of money that would be made by coin redesign, I grant that there is some ambiguity about the testimony that was received by the mint some time ago about the amount of revenue, but there is no question that very substantial money, running into figures in excess of $200 million, would be made by redesigning coins.

The ambiguity relates to some testimony that was given by the mint that I believe related to all five coins when that was before the body for redesign. I want to correct myself. I think the testimony related to one coin and it was for over $250 million, the figure the Senator has used over several years.

If I am correct in believing that the testimony related to one coin, the revenue coming from five would be well in excess of $1 billion. I believe that to be the case. However, I have not used that figure because of the ambiguity. But the current measure, presumably the measure that I would like to see adopted by first rejecting the conference report, would bring in a very substantial amount of money to the Treasury.

Is the chairman aware of the fact that the Post Office now makes approximately $250 million a year by redesigning stamps?

Mr. RIEGLE. Let me say with reference to the earlier point that the Senator from California just made, I think there is a clear consensus, in all of the analyses that I have seen, which indicate a coin redesign can generate a substantial amount of money for saving additional revenue for the Government. I have not heard that disputed. I think we can look at the varying estimates based on the number of coins redesigned, but I know of no one who has challenged that assertion.

With respect to the Postal Service, which has a different status within our Government as quasi-independent as opposed to the Mint, that does in its activities by producing stamps for collectors, principally, raise additional revenues on that basis. Certainly, that is part of why they do it and that is part of their history.

Mr. CRANSTON. The revenues raised last year by the Post Office were approximately $250 million by redesigning stamps, 24 times. It is my believe that the mint should follow suit, perhaps not changing that often, and could thereby make very substantial money, as the bill that I would like to see adopted once again by the Senate and by the House would produce very substantial revenues.

Mr. RIEGLE. If the Senator will yield, I say that I think that analogy is correct in the sense that the Postal Service has demonstrated that through redesign, additional revenues could be generated.

Within the law of course, the Secretary of the Treasury has the authority now, after a 25-year period of time, to be able to self-initiate a coin redesign. We are past the 25-year period when it was last done.

The Treasury Secretary, as I understand it, now would be in the position to take that initiative. For whatever reasons, he has, he has not done so.

But I think the point the Senator is establishing, that certainly chosen coin redesign can generate a savings to the Government, is an accurate statement.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator. Is the Senator aware that we are about to enter the longest period of time in American history without any redesign of any coin?

Mr. RIEGLE. To the best of my knowledge, that is correct. As I say, we are now beyond the 25-year period of time set out in existing law since there has been coin redesign.

Mr. CRANSTON. That concludes the questioning I wanted to address to the chairman of the committee. I want to ask Senator GARN some similar questions. The ranking Republican member of the Banking Committee has been a sponsor of coin redesign and has supported it, as has the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RIEGLE. If the Senator will yield for one other observation from the chairman based on the questions he has just posed and the responses that I have given and my own earlier opening statement, it would be this: That the Senator is correct in noting that the committee has acted on this previously and the Senate as a whole has acted on it previously. The assertions that he has made just now are accurate in terms of the foundations of support.

Our problem here, in my view, has nothing to do with coin redesign, or the merits of the coin redesign. It is the issue that we have run into where the House has now, on two occasions, been unwilling to incorporate that into a package with these commemorative coins. We have now, as the Senator well knows, run into a situation that is stated, I think, quite accurately from the letters of the House that I read into the RECORD and the Senator is familiar with, that we are at the point now where, because of our inability to resolve the coin redesign issue between the House and the Senate, we are going to adversely impact these other commemorative coins which are entirely separate matters of an entirely different sort.

I want to stress again that it is my view that the need to move on the commemorative coins is in no way intended to be prejudicial to the issue that the Senator from California is raising, which he knows and which I affirm I have previously supported and continue to support.

Mr. CRANSTON. I appreciate that comment from the chairman. In other words, if the Senate unwisely, in my view, adopts the conference report and fails to make further reference to achieve the enactment of the coin redesign legislation, that is by no means a repudiation of the concept of coin redesign since all parties to this debate, so far as I know every single Senator, believes that coin redesign makes a great deal of sense, and should be done.

The only problem is, should it be done in connection with this particular bill at this particular time?

Mr. RIEGLE. That is correct. I would go even further than that. While I have reached the conclusion—as I have stated previously, and as the Senator knows, we have to move these other items—that I think the underlying facts laid out here with respect to coin redesign remain clearly there. I expect the Senator to continue to press ahead, should the conference report be adopted, as I hope it will, and he will have my support in so doing.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator for his response to my questions. Before making some more general remarks, I want to comment on one point that was made by the chairman in his opening presentation, where he suggested that we need to act swiftly on the commemorative coins, because time is running out. The mint has taken the position—I think extraordinarily—that it takes a tremendous amount of time to redesign a coin, or to create a new coin of one sort or another.

Let me just offer a bit of history on how long it has taken and, in fact, how short the time required has been in the past to redesign coins or make new coins. The Kennedy half dollar was authorized by Congress on December 30, 1963, and circulation started on January 30, 1964. The total elapsed time was 1 month from the authorization to the coin appearing in circulation. The Lincoln Memorial reverse design was started on September 1, 1958. Circulation began January 3, 1959; time elapse was 4 months. The 1921 Peace Dollar competition was held November 25, 1921. The coin was put into circulation January 13, 1922; time elapse was 6 weeks.

The Susan B. Anthony dollar was something different, because that was a brand new coin, not just a redesign of a circulating coin on one side. That was enacted into law October 10, 1978, requiring that coin to be produced. The first coins were struck in the Philadelphia Mint on December 13, 1978. It took 64 days, including weekends and holidays, to put the Anthony dollar in cir-

culation after the Congress voted to authorize its production.

Changing the reverse on a coin is obviously not analogous to the Susan B. Anthony, in that that coin was totally new in size, shape, weight and denomination for coins.

The quarter and the half dollar, if they are redesigned, will be kept the same size, color, shape, content, weight, and the obverse—the head—will be unchanged. Therefore, with less than half of the amount of work to do, it could be done much more rapidly.

However, the commemorative coins are comparable to the Susan B. Anthony coin in that they are something brand new. To suggest that it would take a long, long time to get into production is nonsense. The mint has actually suggested that it needs 15 months—15 months—to redesign the tail side of a coin. In view of the speed with which coins have been redesigned in the past, that is hard to understand or to accept. If that is the best the mint can do now, the mint needs a serious management overhaul.

Mr. President, now going to the more general matters affecting the matter before us, I called for the defeat of the pending conference report for two main reasons. First, there are compelling institutional reasons for rejecting the conference report. Second, coin redesign—passed by the Senate repeatedly—is the only coin proposal that is of significant and measurable benefit to the whole United States. I am referring there to the commemorative coins that are in the conference report.

Let me explore both of these points in more detail. First, the institutional issue.

This is not a partisan issue. It is an issue between the Senate and the other body in this Congress. Coin redesign is supported, in the Senate, by Democrats, Republicans, liberals, moderates, conservatives. It is demonstrated in the questions I was posing to the chairman of the committee, and his responses, that the leadership of the committee, the chairman and the ranking minority member, Senator GARN, are both supporters of coin redesign.

Coin redesign has been reported out of the Banking Committee several times, always unanimously. It has been passed by the Senate 13 times without one word spoken or one vote cast against it. Once it was introduced by 67 cosponsors. Once it was introduced by Senator DOLE, the Republican leader, Senator SIMPSON, the Republican whip, Senator WALLOP, and myself.

The other body, however, has always ignored the Senate's actions. When we sent coin redesign over as a freestanding bill, it was never considered in the other body. When we sent it over attached to something else, like a housing bill, or in one case a reconciliation bill, when Chairman RIEGLE added redesign to a conference measure to cover a cost incurred by another unrelated item, when this has happened, the other body objected on the specious grounds that our procedure was improper.

The fact is that every Member of Congress knows that it is common practice to attach a measure by amendment to a measure others want for other reasons, whether it be something other Senators want or something the other body wants, or something that is veto-proof because the White House wants it, or a combination of such desires, as is the present case. Certain Senators and House Members want various commemorative coins that are authorized in the pending conference report. The White House wants its commemorative coin; the Senate wants redesign.

So the Senate attached redesign to the commemorative coin bill passed by the other body, but the other body still objected once again—this time for totally false and totally fallacious reasons. The other body obviously expects the Senate to back down. I say we should not back down. We should reject the conference report. We should send it back to conference. We should appoint conferees. We should instruct them to insist on adoption of the Senate's amendments calling for coin redesign.

If the Senate fails to do this, the Senate would be yielding to the other body on a matter about which we have no reason to be weak and acquiescing.

On the other hand, we have very compelling reasons to stand strong and stand firm. We met the other body much more than halfway, making compromise after compromise in the redesign title. I will summarize these compromises shortly. The other body has made no compromise at all. We have offered further compromises. The other body has refused even to consider them. It is time for the Senate to stand up for what it knows is right.

That leads to the second and more important issue: the merit of the Senate redesign proposal.

Mr. President, having discussed the institutional issues in regard to the pending matter, where I feel the Senate's responsibility is to stand up for what it believes, and what is important, I will now talk about the reasons for supporting coin redesign.

The fact is that the coin redesign provisions are the only part of the bill that benefits the whole American public in a measurable and very significant way. All the rest—allegedly so desperately needed right now—are proposals for semiprivate fundraising purposes that are not strictly Government business. They raise millions of dollars for sponsoring organizations.

Let's take a very brief look at each proposal. The White House commemorative coin will produce funds that can be used to refurbish and renovate the White House with new and antique furnishings and so forth. That will be very nice for the President and the White House staff, and it will impress the limited number of Americans and foreigners who manage to visit the White House.

The World Cup commemorative coin will produce funds that will benefit soccer fans, a great many of them foreigners, who will attend the World Cup soccer championships in 1994. And it will benefit a few American cities that will host the games.

The Christopher Columbus quincentennial coin celebrates the "discovery" of America and will please Italian-Americans, it will displease Native Americans. It will also please a Member of the other body in whose honor the Christopher Columbus title of the bill has been named. It will also raise money for a Christopher Columbus foundation that will be run by unnamed individuals and that will grant scholarships.

The Desert Storm medals will be produced so that one can be given to each veteran of the Iraq conflict. The first time we have ever given, incidentally, a medal to every veteran of a war. This will happen, provided a sufficient number of copper duplicates of the medals are purchased by collectors or gifts are received for this purpose from other sources.

The James Madison Bill of Rights commemorative coins will be $5 gold coins; $1 silver coins, and 50-cent silver-copper coins to be sold at a profit, with the profit to go to the James Madison Memorial Trust Fund to be used to promote teaching and graduate study of the Constitution.

The coin redesign provisions of the Senate-passed bill also commemorate the Bill of Rights; but do so in a way that actually produces huge revenues for the U.S. Treasury. The coin redesign provisions call for redesigning the reverse side—the tail side of two coins—the quarter and the half dollar, with designs celebrating the Bill of Rights and commemorating the 200th anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights. This celebration and marking of the Bill of Rights is a good reason for insisting on the Senate's coin redesign amendment, but it is by no means the main reason.

The main reason for rejecting the conference report that is before us and insisting on the Senate amendments calling for coin redesign is that coin redesign will make, as we have already discussed, a great deal of money for the U.S. Treasury painlessly—without any increase in taxes or without any cutting of services. The U.S. Mint estimates that coin redesign will net the Government more than $250 million. That is more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

The Office of Management and Budget approved the revenue estimate and

CBO concurred. That $250 million-plus cannot be spent. It can only be used to reduce the national debt. Some Members of the other body may think that is a small amount, accustomed as we are around here to dealing with billions and even trillions of dollars. I do not think that reducing the horrendous national debt that plagues our economy and our society by more than $250 million is a trivial thing. That is more than $250 million we will not have to borrow and pay interest on in coming years.

There is another reason for not yielding to the other body in this matter. The principal reason for the rejection of coin redesign by the other body was that totally false rumors and charges were circulated about coin redesign. There have been two votes in the other body fairly recently. Just before the first vote, rumors somehow spread like lightening on the floor of the other body that to vote for coin redesign would be a vote against God because it would lead to taking "In God We Trust" off the coins. That is absolutely false. "In God We Trust" occurs on the face side, the head side of the coins, not on the reverse side, the tail side, that coin redesign would call for and, furthermore, present law requires that "In God We Trust" be and remain on all coins.

But that rumor terrified House Members, seeing themselves accused of voting against God and down went the measure. We dealt with that in conference. We specifically then added language stating what was already actually the fact, by stating in the bill that was going to be voted upon that "In God We Trust" had to remain on the coins.

It was also alleged that coin redesign would be costly, would cost taxpayers, would be a new burden of expense. That, too, as we have already discussed, was obviously, very, very false information. The Senate should not throw up its hands and give up because of blatant misrepresentation.

I have already mentioned the concurrence of the mint, OMB, and CBO that coin redesign would make more than $250 million for the U.S. Treasury. The fact is that coins have been redesigned 68 times in American history. Every single time redesign has produced revenues painlessly for the U.S. Treasury—every single time.

Redesign is profitable for three reasons: One is something called seigniorage. That is the difference between the cost of producing the coin and what people pay for it. Example: It costs 2.5 cents to mint and put into circulation a quarter; it is bought for 25 cents. That is a net profit of 22.5 cents for every quarter.

Second, there is interest earned on seigniorage.

And third there are earnings on sales to collectors of proof sets and uncirculated sets of coins. That is where the revenues come from.

There are 10 million coin collectors in America—many in every State of every U.S. Senator. There are also millions of foreign coin collectors and all of these people are looking for the day when there will be a redesign of American coins for them to collect.

The post office, as we mentioned a bit ago, redesigns stamps with great regularity and makes approximately $250 million every year from the new designs. Last year, that was the net profit to the Treasury as a result of redesigning 24 stamps.

We dealt with this cost issue in the conference and amended bill to provide that there would be no redesign if there would be any cost to the Federal Government which obviously was not really needed. But it was put there to placate and to make plain to people who fell for the false rumor that there would be a cost, that there would be no cost.

It was also suggested in the other body that redesign would confuse the American people in this time of economic crisis in our country. I say that is an insult to the American people. They have dealt regularly with stamp changes, Zip Code changes, area code changes, and a myriad of other innovations. Surely, they have the capacity to tell one coin from another.

The question might be asked, what about the Susan B. Anthony dollar? It failed. It failed for a very good reason. It was exactly the same size as a quarter and that did lead to confusion. But there will be no such confusion when a coin is simply redesigned. The Senate redesign bill, I emphasize, will not change the size, shape, weight, color, or metallic content of any coin.

It was also suggested in the course of debate in the other body that coin redesign would be destabilizing in this time of economic difficulty in our country. Yet, many of our worst economic problems stem from our huge national debt and our towering deficits. How can a measure that would reduce the havoc-wreaking national debt by a quarter of a billion dollars, thereby reducing Federal borrowing, possibly be destabilizing? The fact is coin redesign occurred in the middle of the Great Depression in 1932, to be precise. It was accepted; there was no confusion and no destabilization.

I ask unanimous consent that a table be printed in the RECORD showing the years in which various coins have been changed.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEARS VARIOUS COINS HAVE BEEN CHANGED

$.01: 1793, 1794, 1794, 1798, 1857, 1859, 1860, 1909, 1959 rev.
$.02: 1867.
$.03: 1830, 1843, 1855, 1861.
$.05: 1866, 1883, 1913, 1938.
$.10: 1796, 1798 rev., 1809, 1837, 1892, 1916, 1946.
$.25: 1796, 1804 rev., 1815, 1838, 1892, 1916, 1932, 1975–6 rev.
$.50: 1793, 1794, 1796 obv., 1798, 1801 rev., 1807 total, 1838, 1839, 1865, 1888, 1892, 1913, 1916, 1938, 1948, 1964, 1975–6 rev.
$1: 1793, 1798, 1834, 1840, 1840, 1840, 1873, 1878, 1921, 1971, 1978.
$2.5: 1840, 1908.
$5: 1795, 1820, 1908,
$10: 1795, 1820, 1908.
$20: 1795, 1820, 1908.

SUMMARY OF YEARS COINS REDESIGNED

1793, 1793, 1793, 1794, 1794, 1794, 1795, 1795, 1795, 1796, 1796, 1796, 1798, 1798, 1798, 1801, 1804, 1807, 1809, 1813, 1820, 1820, 1820, 1820, 1834, 1837, 1838, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1840, 1840, 1840, 1855, 1857, 1859, 1861, 1864, 1865, 1873, 1878, 1882, 1892, 1892, 1892, 1908, 1908, 1908, 1908, 1913, 1913, 1916, 1916, 1916, 1921, 1932, 1938, 1938, 1946, 1948, 1959, 1964, 1975–6, 1975–6, 1975–6, 1978.

The present time is one of the longest periods this country has gone without a redesign change.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the fact is we are about to go into the longest period than we have ever gone in American history without a coin change. It is time for a change, time for a change here, and it is time for a change in many other aspects of our society and the doings of our Federal Government.

When we dealt with the God issue and the cost issue, a new false issue was dreamed by. The Senate conferees, in the spirit of compromise that is often the mark of a successful conference, had proposed reducing from five circulating coins to two the number of circulating coins that would be redesigned. The Senate has repeatedly passed a measure calling for redesign of all five circulating coins.

Accordingly, in conference, we dropped redesign of the penny, the nickel and the dime, leaving only the quarter and half dollar to be redesigned. That led to a new false charge that was hurled concerning the American eagle that presently appears on the reverse side, the tail side of the quarter and the half dollar. It was alleged untruthfully that it would be unpatriotic to vote for redesign because the bill mandated taking the eagle off the quarter and the half dollar.

The bill did no such thing. But down the bill went again, but this time only by the narrow margin of 7 votes; only 7 votes caused it to go down and there were something like 30 absentees.

The Eagle issue, like the God issue, can be dealt with. So I urge that the matter go back to conference so we can make very plain by new language that the eagle shall remain on the reverse of the quarter and the half dollar.

Incidentally, we have had 25 different versions of the quarter and the half dollar in our Nation's history—some with one eagle or some other eagle and some with no Eagle.

There is an interesting story about the particular Eagle—now on the back of the quarter—that Members of the

other body believe should be preserved exactly as presently designed, even if that preservation costs our country $250 million. The quarter was to be redesigned back in 1931. The Commission of Fine Arts conducted a design contest. The contest was won by a woman, a great artist named Laura Garden Fraser. However, Secretary of the Treasury Mellon overruled the Fine Arts Commission, rejected Laura Garden Fraser and chose an eagle designed by a man. It turned out that the Secretary felt that artistry was a man's work, not a woman's work.

Unemployment was huge then in the Depression and men needed jobs, while the woman's place, the Treasury Secretary felt, was in the home. The Secretary felt all this was particularly true when it came to designing coins for the world of commerce which was surely, in his view, the realm of men, not women.

The current Senate's redesign proposal might, in this more enlightened age, lead to an eagle on the quarter designed—of all things—by a woman. If, that is, the Senate stands by its convictions.

I feel very strongly, Mr. President, that the Senate should not succumb to wild rumors and false charges, particularly when a $250 million painless reduction in the horrendous national debt is at stake.

The manager of the bill in the other body complained about what he called the misrepresentation of facts by opponents of redesign. We should not be bullied and pushed around by misrepresentations and specious arguments.

Coin redesign will be economically beneficial to our country at a time when our economic needs are very great. I fail to see the urgency of dropping a pain-free 250 million-plus profit for the U.S. Treasury simply because of the complaints of semiprivate groups that they need their commemorative coins right now. That is why I urge rejection of the conference report and recommittal.

If we stand proud, if we stand fast, if we stand firm, we can knock $250 million-plus off the deficit painlessly. By making passage of the White House, Christopher Columbus, and the other commemorative coins contingent on passage of coin redesign, we can attain coin redesign. If we yield to the other body, the other body will get what it has passed, but we will not get coin redesign and we will not get reduction of the deficit by more than $250 million.

There are other reasons, valid and important reasons, for coin redesign: educational, cultural, artistic, and technological.

Coins travel the world and will reflect our society for thousands of years to come. Coins reflect the evolution of civilization. In many countries, a person's only contact with America is by holding in one's hand one of our coins. Our coins should represent our best contemporaneous art and the ideals of which we are most proud, like the Bill of Rights.

Witness after witness has testified at Senate and House Banking Committee hearings that it is time for change and that we can do better with the coins of the greatest Nation on Earth by using the work of living artists of today.

For all these reasons and more, Mr. President, I urge rejection of the conference report and resubmittal with instructions to stand by the Senate coin redesign measure.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Who yields time to the Senator?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOND. I thank my colleague from Florida.

Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support passage of the conference report. The House has already passed this conference report by a vote of 410 to 0. As we all know, the saga of this coin package is amazingly long and drawn out, with most of the debate centering around the coin redesign bill.

I happen to think that our colleague from California makes a very good point. I think he has a strong argument. The Senate has passed the coin package with coin redesign included twice, and twice the House has rejected the package because of the inclusion of coin redesign. We have tried to convince the House to accept coin redesign. We have done everything we can. But they have repeatedly refused. They appear adamant not to accept a coin package if it contains coin redesign.

Today we have another opportunity to pass the coin bills. I fear it is our last opportunity, and that is why I say that we should pass the conference report.

The House majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, the House minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, the House majority whip, Mr. BONIOR, the minority whip, Mr. GINGRICH, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, Mr. TORRES, and the ranking Republican, Mr. MCCANDLESS, have written letters to our majority and minority leaders expressing their strong belief that if the Senate does not pass the conference report as it stands, without coin redesign, there will be no coin legislation at all this year.

This conference report, as we know, does not contain coin redesign. It simply contains five coin bills for which time is quickly running out.

I had the honor of playing an active role in the White House coin bill. It is designed to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the White House, which is this October. That only gives the mint 6 months to mint the coin and get it ready for circulation. That is barely enough time. We will not have time unless we move expeditiously.

Contrary to what has been said earlier, the White House coin bill will not raise money to refurbish the White House with new furnishings and artwork. The money is to keep the current artwork and furnishings in repair for which there is no Government money.

Mr. President, I imagine that all of my colleagues are besieged, as I am, with requests from our constituents for tickets to visit the White House. Certainly one of the preeminent stops of any tourist, American or foreign, is the White House. We believe the White House is a national treasure, and this bill would enable us to support that national treasure.

I also have here a letter from Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson to the chairman of the White House Endowment Fund urging support of this measure. She says:

When Lyndon was in Congress and later the White House, I still remember the excitement and delight countless school children and visitors took in touring the mansion. The restoration and presentation of the public rooms of that great House and the expansion and maintenance of its fine arts collection deserve wide citizen support, which I believe will be helped immensely by the sale of the commemorative coin.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STONEWALL, TX,
April 22, 1992.

Mrs. EARLE M. CRAIG, Jr.,
Chairman, the White House Endowment Fund, Midland, TX.

DEAR MRS. CRAIG: It was a great pleasure to learn that the House and the Senate are moving forward on the White House Commemorative Coin Act. It is very appealing to me, and I strongly support its authorization.

When Lyndon was in Congress and later the White House, I still remember the excitement and delight countless school children and visitors took in touring the Mansion. The restoration and presentation of the public rooms of that great House and the expansion and maintenance of its fine arts collection deserve wide citizen support, which I believe will be helped immensely by the sale of the commemorative coin.

These sales will provide funding needed to supplement private donations to the White House Endowment Fund, to which you have so ably given your leadership. I know the White House Historical Association's partnership has been invaluable, and as one citizen, I am deeply grateful to all of you for the care and dedication you bring to this outstanding effort.

With a large salute,

Sincerely,

LADY BIRD JOHNSON.

Mr. BOND. If we do not adopt the conference report today, there will be

no White House coin, which means that the White House Endowment Fund, founded by First Lady Barbara Bush, will lose $5 million of critical funding for the maintenance of the White House art collection, antique furnishings, and public rooms for which Government funds are not available.

There are other pressing measures included in this: The James Madison Bicentennial of the Bill of Rights coin, the Christopher Columbus coin. All of these are vital and hanging in the balance.

I have myself talked at great length with our former colleague, Senator Jim McClure of Idaho, who is working hard to get the World Cup commemorative coin bill passed, which is part of this measure.

Those of us who are soccer fans know that the World Cup is the largest single sport event in the world.

It is the first time in history the United States has been selected to host the games. The coin sales will generate between $30 and $40 million from this primary event, and will be used to help defray costs associated with hosting the games by the local host cities.

The World Cup coin must be enacted immediately to give the U.S. Mint sufficient time to design, produce, and market the coins. I think our U.S. Department of Commerce has estimated that about 1½ million visitors will be attracted by that event, and it will pour at least $1.5 billion in direct tourism revenue into the Treasury.

All of these coins are vital. I am not here to argue against the merits of the coin redesign. I am simply stating the facts as they appear, as the lineup is between this body and the other body.

It is clear that the House will not accept the coin redesign bill. Therefore, I urge my colleagues, in the strongest possible terms, due to the time sensitivity of these other measures, to support the conference report to the White House Commemorative Coin Act as it was passed by the House.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as is required.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate, bordering on the embarrassing, that we are having this debate this morning. In a nation with so many concerns—from the economic well-being of our people, to the desire for reform in our health care system, to the need to restructure our education system to assure that we will be competitive in the world of the future, and so many other urgent national priorities—that we should be devoting 2 hours this morning to debating a bill on the minting of various coins and the proposal for redesign of two of our existing coins borders on a waste of valuable Senate time.

In order to reduce that waste to just that which has already been committed, I urge my colleagues to do as the Senator from Missouri has just suggested: Adopt this conference report and let us end this debate today. The consequence of not adopting this conference report will be further stalemate on this issue. It will, in my opinion, be that none of the measures contained in the conference report will be adopted in 1992. At a minimum, it will be that further effort of this Congress is devoted to this subject, which deserves no further commitment of our time or our energy.

I am here primarily because I was the sponsor of one of the five measures contained in the conference report, the measure which would strike a coin in commemoration of the World Cup. As the Senator from Missouri has already indicated, this event, which will take place in 1994, is the largest single sporting event in the world; 140 countries will compete for the opportunity to host these games, and to support our role as host, this legislation has been suggested.

Already there has been a price paid for delay. Many American cities wanted to host, to provide the venue for the World Cup games. It had the original expectation that 12 cities would be selected. A premise of that number 12 was that this legislation would be enacted, the proceeds of which will be used to support the efforts at the local community level.

In some instances, stadiums which are primarily designed for other sports—baseball, football—will require some refurbishment in order to be able to accommodate world-class soccer. Other modifications or support for the events will be funded by the proceeds raised from the sale of this World Cup coin.

Because of the vacillation and delay in the passage of this legislation, the International Federation, instead of selecting 12 cities, has in fact selected only 9. Boston, Detroit, Orlando, Los Angeles, Dallas, Washington, San Francisco, Chicago, and the Meadowlands of Rutherford, NJ, are the selected sites. Three American cities have been denied the opportunity to share in this enormous event, an event which the U.S. Department of Commerce estimates will generate $1.5 billion in tourist revenue.

So there has been a price paid already for delay in the passage of this legislation. Further delay will make it more difficult for these selected cities to carry out there responsibilities, and for the Nation to take full benefit of this important activity.

As has been previously mentioned, the issue here is not whether we should or should not redesign the 25- and 50-cent coins of the United States. The Senate has already twice passed legislation that would direct such redesign. The issue now is purely pragmatic; that is, will we pass legislation to authorize the five coins which have thus far received the support of both the House and the Senate, or shall the entire program of coin minting for these commemorative purposes, as well as coin redesign, be consigned to the legislative ash heap for 1992?

I will submit for the RECORD a letter dated April 15 of this year, signed by the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the majority whip of the House of Representatives, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, which concludes with this paragraph:

It is our judgment that despite our best efforts, a majority of the House will not support the redesign provision as part of this package. We believe that any efforts to reopen the conference will only serve to further delay passage of the time-sensitive bills in the package and will effectively kill the legislation for this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter dated April 15 to the Honorable GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Senate majority leader.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 15, 1992.

Hon. GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MITCHELL: On April 8, 1992, the House agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 3337, the Omnibus Commemorative Act of 1992 by a vote of 414–0. As you are aware, this vote on the conference report came after an intense struggle and two votes in the House in which an amendment to redesign the "tail" of our circulating coinage was rejected.

While the first vote may have been influenced by rumor and innuendo, the inaccuracy that characterized the debate was largely absent prior to the second vote. Moreover, the second vote was a rejection of a compromise redesign proposal that had been sharply limited. The second vote on this compromise clearly demonstrated the unwillingness of the House to approve coin redesign in any form.

We worked hard, as did the sponsor of the amendment, Senator Cranston, to get the House to accept the provision. In fact, all the outside interest groups whose bills were part of this package also worked hard to convince House members to support the redesign provision. Unfortunately, a majority of the House, on two occasions, rejected our views and the House and Senate conferees agreed to drop the redesign provision in order to expedite passage of the remainder of the package which is time sensitive.

Two of the programs included in H.R. 3337, The Christopher Columbus Quincentenary and the White House Commemorative Coin Act, are 1992 programs. The U.S. Mint has indicated that "If enactment is not forthcoming very soon, the Mint will be severely limited in its ability to fully produce and market these coins."

It is our judgment that despite our best efforts, a majority of the House will not support the redesign provision as part of this package. We believe that any efforts to reopen the conference will only serve to further delay passage of the time sensitive bills

in the package and will effectively kill the legislation for this year.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Gephardt, Majority Leader; David E. Bonior, Majority Whip; Esteban E. Torres, Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, if there is merit in the coin redesign—I suggest that there is merit—it is merit which should be considered singularly. There is no rational reason why the coin redesign measure must be linked to these other five bills, other than the political rationale that it requires the healing of the uplift of these five bills, each of which has some degree of time urgency in order for it to be politically viable.

The fact is that instead of rising with the updraft of the other five bills, from the letter that has just been submitted for the RECORD, it appears as if the coin redesign is an anchor which drags all of these proposals, including those that would commemorate the 500th anniversary of the great expedition of Christopher Columbus legislation, important to the refurbishment of the White House for scholarship programs, as well as the World Cup coin bill—all of those would be lost as a result of the failure of this conference report.

Mr. President, let me conclude with the comments that I began with; that is, the fact that the Senate of the United States should not be trivializing itself by continuing this debate. We have already spent too much time on the issue of commemorative coins and redesign of existing coins.

There is great public disdain about the operations of this Federal Government. There are many reasons for this public negative attitude. I believe it is our responsibility to commence the process of reversing that public attitude, and the place to start is by dealing with those issues that the public is genuinely concerned with.

Americans understand that we are in a new era. They understand that the end of the cold war has caused not only new obligations internationally, but also new standards to be set in terms of our domestic public policy. The American public wants this Congress to be dealing with things that are important to them. The American public loses trust when they see us spending time on issues that they consider to be trivial in their importance, marginal to their lives, and to be unimportant in terms of America's position in the world.

Mr. President, I suggest we bring this chapter, which has already consumed too many pages, to a conclusion. We should do that by voting yes on the conference report.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I support the conference report to H.R. 3337. Many of us have been working on the passage of these commemorative coins programs for more than a year. We are voting today on the results of the Senate-House conference, and no one objects to the commemorative coins; the issue that remains controversial is Senator CRANSTON's coin redesign proposals.

Senator CRANSTON has been successful in passing the redesign language several times in the Senate, but the House has refused to accept these proposals. In fact, in the past several months, the House has specifically voted twice against the coin redesign proposals, even after Senator CRANSTON personally called nearly 100 House Members to persuade their votes on this issue.

Senator CRANSTON would tell us that coin redesign failed due to false rumors and, to a certain degree, he is right. The Senator from California never intended to take the words, "In God We Trust" off the coins. He did, however, insert language in the first conference report that would have technically allowed the American eagle to be removed from the tail side of a half-dollar and quarter-dollar coins. Senator CRANSTON has indicated that he would correct that language. But in my view, even that is not the primary problem. The House vote to recommit this legislation to conference was, in fact, a vote against coin redesign.

I have been notified by House leaders that passage of coin redesign in the House does not seem possible this year. I have to tell you that I have been over there a number of times working to try to get a coin bill through. They are very strong in their opinions of what needs to be done. Unfortunately, they are unwilling to satisfy the desires of Senator CRANSTON. In fact, some House Banking Committee members have said that a conference committee will not be reconvened if this conference report is rejected today.

This is not a partisan issue. House Democrats and Republicans both voted for and against coin redesign. I understand the frustration of the Senator from California. We are all frustrated from time to time around here. There may well be merits to coin redesign. Quite honestly, I wish we did not need to debate this matter today. But when the House refuses to accept coin redesign, returning this matter to conference happens to be a futile effort. It is a waste of valuable Senate time. I believe that the distinguished Senator from California understands the need for passage of these commemorative coins, and I am sorry that we, the sponsors of the commemorative coins, are being put in a position of opposition to Senator CRANSTON and his position. But I find it distressing that these coin bills, all with great merits of their own, are being held hostage to coin redesign. Our primary concern today is to get these commemorative coins passed so that these programs may finally begin.

If we do not accept this conference report, the Christopher Columbus coins and the White House coin will never be minted, because there is not enough time left in 1992. The Persian Gulf silver medal is long overdue, and it should be minted. It should be awarded to our courageous men and women of the military.

The Madison coin design competition should be under way now so there is adequate time for minting and marketing of these coins next year. Senator KENNEDY and I have worked for well over a year on this in and of itself. We met with people of the House and Members of the Senate, and we have worked hard. We believe the Madison Foundation is extremely important, and this is one of the best ways of funding it. It is critical to us. Yet, that will help high school kids all over this country. It would be one of the best things for education we could possibly do. We need the Madison coin.

The U.S.A. World Cup Soccer Organizing Committee has not been able to make responsible commitments to either the World Soccer Federation or the host venue cities here in the United States. The World Cup committee needs to know it can count on the revenue that these coins will raise. I am treasurer of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Organization, the beneficiary organization of the Madison coins. TED KENNEDY, our colleague, is chairman of the foundation. I have to say that I have never seen anybody work harder on an issue that nobody really disagrees with to get this coin through. In an effort to fully endow this Foundation, we have been determined to pass this coin legislation, which calls for the minting of 300,000 gold $5 coins, 900,000 silver dollar coins, and 1 million silver half-dollar coins.

Our program calls for very low mintage. In fact, we have even lowered the traditional surcharges added to these coins in an effort to offer the coin collectors of this Nation a reasonable and a valuable collector's item.

The James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation was established by Congress in 1986. We have been trying to move it forward ever since that time. The Foundation was created to encourage outstanding current and future high school teachers of American history, American Government, and, of course, social studies, to undertake graduate study of the roots, framing, principles, and development of the Constitution of the United States. What more of a humble purpose can you have? It is a bipartisan effort. Senator KENNEDY and I have worked side by side with other Members of Congress to push this through. The Foundation commemorates the bicentennial of the Constitution and is one of the few things that honors James Madison, the fourth President of the United States, and generally acknowledged to be the

father of the Constitution. It is about time we did something for him.

The Foundation is an independent establishment of the executive branch of the Federal Government. Its trust fund is preserved in a special account in the Treasury of the United States. All funds raised in the sale of these coins will be deposited in this trust fund for the single purpose of educational fellowships. Support for awards and administrative expenses comes from interest on the trust, as well as from the funds the Foundation raises from individuals, corporations, foundations, and other public sources.

The strength and the integrity of our American Government depend upon the citizens' knowledge of their Government and of their rights and their responsibilities under it. Yet, as has been repeatedly demonstrated, their knowledge is sorely lacking today. Even many teachers—those who bear a heavy responsibility for imparting civic spirit to our young people—are not deeply versed in the knowledge of the Constitution to impart to the thousands of American students who, as adults, will govern the Nation, its communities, and its institutions. In particular, some of these teachers lack knowledge of the Constitution's history, principles, and development of the Government formed under it.

The foundation, therefore, provides support for master's degree level graduate study to a select number of experienced and aspiring secondary teachers from all parts of the Nation. The premise of its programs will be that constitutionally learned teachers will convey their own strength and knowledge to thousands of American children who, as adults, will govern the Nation and its communities and institutions.

No other foundation or program currently addresses and meets this need, nor does any other foundation make meeting this need its sole mission. None other has the capacity through stable and continuing programs to offer support for study of the Constitution by both experienced and would-be teachers across the land. None other aims to broaden and deepen teachers' knowledge of the founding principles of the Constitution and to educate them in diffusing that knowledge. The foundation conducts an annual nationwide competition to select its fellows, who are selected for their academic achievements and their desire to be more knowledgeable secondary school teachers. Fellows must have demonstrated interest in pursuing a course of study that emphasizes the Constitution, and they must exhibit a willingness to devote themselves to civil responsibility.

Each year, at least one Madison fellow is selected from each State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the combined U.S. territories. All James Madison fellows must agree to teach full time in secondary schools for at least 1 year for each year of assistance. If this requirement is not met, the recipient must reimburse the foundation for all assistance plus interest. The foundation strongly encourages all fellows to return to their home States to teach.

Mr. President, the foundation has just awarded 48 fellowships to teachers across this Nation. We would like to double that number next year. With the financial help from these coins, that will certainly be possible. It is time to end this long delay in passing H.R. 3337. I have to tell you that it is critical to the Madison Foundation and to all who have asked for coins at this time.

I feel sorry about my friend from California, that his wishes cannot be met here. I think those of us in the Senate would normally love to meet those wishes. But to be honest with you, the House is not going to take that, no matter what we do, and it may kill this bill forever. If that is so, these organizations lose, and the country does as well. It is time to end the long delay in passing this. I ask my colleagues to vote yes on the conference report. I hope we can get these organizations and these coins minted, pressed, and out to the public at large.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Does the Senator from New York seek time on this issue?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I do. I would like 10 minutes, if that is possible. I see the Senator from Alaska is here.

Mr. RIEGLE. The Senator from Alaska is here. He needs 4 minutes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Why do I not take 5.

Mr. RIEGLE. I will be happy to yield 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield whatever time is needed not to intrude on the time of the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California controls 1 minute, 17 seconds.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I stand in support of a measure that has passed the Senate 13 times. I stand in support of Senator CRANSTON's view, his proposal, which is singular in these times. He proposes to earn the Treasury a quarter of a billion dollars, add to the happiness of millions of American coin collectors, advance the arts, and give employment to those rarest of workers, the engravers. Such a combination of wonderful things you could only associate with the senior Senator from California.

Mr. President, I am the Senator from New York, which happens to be the headquarters of the American Numismatic Association, which is very much in favor of the Cranston measure. The Numismatic Association museum is an absolute treasure. You have to go in it to get some sense of the history of coins and what they mean to the world. They are, perhaps, our oldest art form, certainly the oldest art form associated with the State. They tell you so much. They tell you, for example, how sacred these things have been. It was not until Alexander the Great that a Greek dared to put his own face on a coin of his realm. Even then he was represented as Pericles with a lion's head. Not even the worst of the tyrants would dare defy the gods by putting his own visage on a coin. Coins have always been mythic, representative, and evocative.

My heavens, this Chamber shook and rattled for two generations on the subject of the free coinage of silver. My golly, did we not orate on that. And it was felt in the most recent example, the coinage of the Susan B. Anthony dollar. I would have to say we are all disappointed with it. We New Yorkers are. People who live in Rochester especially so. Susan B. Anthony lived in Rochester.

The Anthony dollar designed without wide enough participation. It came out of the mint without congressional involvement, without enough participation to say is this going to look different from all other coins. I can tell you, no place throughout the State is there greater interest, in coinage, perhaps, than in Rochester. The Rochester Democrat and Chronical, not long ago, had a competition. If we had some new coins, what would the readers have them look like? The mails were filled. They loved this. It is part of the joy of Government.

I think of our neighbors, the Canadians, what wonderful coins they have produced in recent years, which is very important to them because when they speak of Canada, they speak of unity. And they found a symbol of unity in the loon. And the Canadians love their loonies, as they call them. And they know they have done something they feel good about. We will feel good about this, too.

Coin collecting—if ever there was a source of innocent merriment it is collecting coins. It is teaching, learning, conserving. The millions of coin collectors across the country would appreciate the redesign of our coins.

We could use a quarter of a billion dollars, Mr. President. Is there anybody here who thinks we do not need a quarter of a billion dollars? I see no Senator has risen in opposition to that point of view. I simply hope we will have the good sense to return this matter to conference. It will come back quickly. I thank the Chair. I congratulate my friend from California.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, the Senator makes a typically wonderful statement full of history and insight. It is just a pleasure to hear him speak.

Does the Senator wish additional time? Let me, then yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I do thank the Senator. I support the conference report and I do wish to go on record to that effect and I am grateful to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I support this conference report and urge the Senate approve it as the other body has. I am particularly concerned about a couple of the items in here.

Obviously, the Senate knows there are five new coins that the mint will create pursuant to this legislation. In terms of the White House I do not think there is any place that Alaskans like to go when they come down here, more than that—to visit the White House. I think this coin that is authorized to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the White House will be very popular with all Americans. Certainly, this will give us a new source to help maintain and renovate the house that the Nation provides to the President.

I am hopeful that the Senate will not find any objections.

Having been a Member of the Bicentennial Commission, I am also most interested in the coin honoring James Madison and commemorating the Bill of Rights. This happens to be a subject that I will cover in what we call a capital exchange program with schoolchildren in my State the next time that we have that program.

Americans exercise the rights guaranteed them by the Bill of Rights every day, but sometimes we take that Bill of Rights for granted. And I do believe the bicentennial celebration regarding the Bill of Rights is restoring its vitality, reminding Americans that it is a living, breathing document that means a great deal to our Nation. I support that coin also.

As has been already stated here, the proceeds from that coin will be used to train teachers who are interested in constitutional studies.

Another coin is the coin honoring the Persian Gulf veterans. There are hundreds of thousands of men and women who left their homes to defend the interests of our country and to help liberate the people of Kuwait. We had a series of Alaskans who fought in that engagement. Only one of them, Sgt. David Douthit, laid down his life for our country.

I urge the Senate approve this coin so that those whose fathers and husbands who sacrificed their lives for our country will have a tangible reminder of that engagement, and honor all of those who served.

The coin honoring the 500th anniversary of Christopher Columbus' discovery of the New World will bring funds for scholarships. We have, in addition to that, the World Cup coin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent to Senator GARN by the Under Secretary for Travel and Tourism of the Department of Commerce be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STEVENS. This coin, too, is part of the whole package that will raise a sizable amount of money. I am told the CBO stated to the Appropriations Committee, by a letter of April 8, that this measure will reduce outlays of the Federal Government by $26 million. That is a substantial amount of savings. It ought not to be ignored as the Senate addresses this conference report.

I am hopeful it will be readily approved today when we vote upon it.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for his courtesy and yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, April 23, 1992.

Hon. JAKE GARN,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GARN: This is to request your assistance in obtaining expeditious passage of H.R. 3337, the "Omnibus Commemorative Coin Act."

Included in the bill is "the World Cup USA 1994 Commemorative Coin Act" which would authorize the sale of World Cup commemorative coins, the revenue from which would offset some of the expenses associated with America's hosting, for the first time, the World Cup international soccer championship in the Summer of 1994.

As you may know, the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration (USTTA) works to develop tourism in the United States and promote our country as a prime destination for international business and leisure travelers. Last year the tourism industry generated receipts of $327 billion, with international visitation to the U.S. accounting for nearly $40 billion in receipts, creating a $10.5 billion trade surplus.

In two years, the World Cup game will be played in nine U.S. cities and generate approximately $1.5 billion in tourist revenue. Also, because nearly two-thirds of our 42 million international visitors last year were repeat visitors, we expect to reap a very positive economic impact—beyond 1994—from a successful World Cup.

However, the World Cup Organizing Committee, along with the nine host cities, will bear heavy costs for promotion and security for the games. It is estimated that sales of the World Cup commemorative coin will generate an estimated $40 million to offset these costs. These revenues will go a long way toward ensuring success for this historic event for the United States.

In short, the World Cup needs the support that can be provided by enactment of H.R. 3337, the "Omnibus Commemorative Coin Act." And I respectfully request that you support its expeditious passage.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. KELLER, Jr.,
Under Secretary for Travel and Tourism.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I have only 1 minute. If the Senator from Michigan will yield me some additional time, I would be grateful.

Mr. RIEGLE. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I will keep 1 minute. Why do I not yield 6 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. I appreciate that very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, let me say I do not view this as a trivial matter. I do not view garnering a quarter of billion dollars painlessly to the Federal Government to reduce the national debt as a trivial matter that we should not spend an appropriate time considering.

I want also to say that I appreciate those who have called this my bill. It is not my bill alone. Senator WALLOP from the Republican side has been a cosponsor with me of this measure repeatedly. Senator DOLE, the majority leader and Senator SIMPSON, the minority whip, have been among the principal sponsors of this measure.

Of those who have spoken against coin redesign today, although they are supporters of coin redesign generally, let me cite the fact that Senator STEVENS of Alaska, Senator HATCH of Utah, Senator BOND of Missouri, have all been cosponsors of the measure calling for coin redesign as has Senator GARN, the ranking Republican member of the committee.

They have all worked for coin redesign several times, as has Senator GRAHAM of Florida, who also spoke. The point is that they feel that we should not proceed with coin redesign at this time because of the circumstances in the House of Representatives. They support coin redesign very strongly in principle.

I would like to read into the RECORD, a letter addressed to all Senators by Beth Deisher, who is the editor of Coin World. Her letter reads as follows:

On behalf of U.S. coin collectors and as editor of the world's largest numismatic collectibles news weekly with circulation in all 50 states and 39 foreign countries, I ask you to join Senators Alan Cranston and Malcolm Wallop in their effort to have the Senate-House Conference Committee Report on H.R. 3337 recommitted to the conference committee with instructions to Senate conferees to reinstate coinage redesign.

The U.S. Senate has approved legislation 13 times since 1988 calling for new designs on the reverses (tails sides) of our circulating coins. Coinage redesign was added last fall as one of the titles to the omnibus coin bill, H.R. 3337. However redesign opponents in the House of Representatives, using confusion and outright falsehoods, succeeded in removing coinage redesign from the Senate-Conference report.

We ask you to stand firm and support restoration of coinage redesign. Initially the coin redesign title called for new designs for all five circulating coins. Senate conferees compromised in good faith and are now seek-

ing redesign of the reverses of only the half dollar and the quarter dollar.

New designs for circulating coins is a WIN-WIN for everyone.

New art on our coins could be seen and appreciated by every American in their daily lives. New designs would draw attention to our nation's ideals and aspirations, as interpreted by artists of our time. New designs could return us to an American tradition—enacted into law by Congress in 1892 but lost sight of by Treasury bureaucrats in the latter part of the 20th century—of changing designs every 25 years.

New designs would generate significant revenue for the government because each new coin saved as a souvenir of the design change earns money which could be used to pay against our mounting national debt. It is extremely important to understand that coin redesign is the only part of the omnibus coin proposal which serves the national interest by substantially reducing the national debt at no cost to taxpayers. Four other titles in H.R. 3337 call for issuance of commemorative coins for special interest groups that seek the money generated by surcharges (taxes on the coins) as a means of funding their endeavors. The people who have been buying the commemorative coins—and paying the hefty surcharges (taxes)—are the coin collectors in the numismatic community, who have never benefitted from the surcharges.

Coin collectors of this nation, which by some estimates number as high as 10 million, are the advocates of coin redesign because they realize that coin redesign will draw the public's attention to coins. If the U.S. government expects to expand its sales of commemorative coins, it must become involved in and take some responsibility for maintaining the vitality of the hobby of coin collecting. Redesigning circulating coins is a much needed step toward that worthy goal.

It is our understanding that Senators Cranston and Wallop will lead a Senate floor debate April 28 before you are asked to vote on this important issue. I urge you to listen to them and to support them in their quest to reinstate coin redesign in H.R. 3337.

Sincerely,

BETH DEISHER,
Editor, Coin World.

Mr. President, I would also like to briefly read from a speech made in the other body when this matter was being considered; the speech made by Congressman KOLBE of Arizona, who very eloquently first touched upon the commemorative coins: Columbus, White House, World Cup, James Madison, and also the silver medal.

Then he asked:

I ask, who actually will pay these surcharges? The answer is coin collectors and dealers. It's no secret that this is an easy way to fund a pet project: Circumvent the appropriations process and let this tiny sector of the economy pick up the costs.

Opponents say there is no support for the coin redesign measure. Let me remind my colleagues that there is very strong support for coin redesign from the coin collecting community—the very people who are funding all these special projects.

So here we have a situation where we are asking coin collectors to pay all these surcharges. But when they ask for a minor change in the appearance of our coins in order to maintain the vitality of their hobby, we say they are asking too much.

I disagree.

Opponents say there is nothing wrong with the designs on our coins. That is true. But let me offer another perspective. Fifty years ago, Toscanini recorded the nine Beethoven symphonies in performances that are still hailed as brilliant. Yet major symphony orchestras continue to record Beethoven symphonies—not because there is anything wrong with the Tosconini performances or because they can improve on the artistic quality. New recordings are made because different people have their own idea about what beauty is.

What opponents of coin redesign seem to be saying is that there are no artists or sculptors alive today who are capable of designing a beautiful coin. They claim there is nothing more to be said about the aesthetics of our coins—it was done 50 years ago.

Let me emphasize—There is nothing wrong with current coin designs. But I think that among 250 million Americans, there is an artist capable of designing another beautiful quarter and half-dollar. And I, for one, would like to see the work of a living American artist on circulating coins.

That is Congressman KOLBE of Arizona.

Mr. President, I reiterate my urgent recommendation that the Senate defeat the conference report and send this matter back to conference so we can get coin redesign and save for our Government $250 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, in the moments I have left, let me say I think it is very important we pass this conference report, notwithstanding the points made by the Senator from California.

We have two separate and good purposes that canhot be reconciled at this particular time, as we have been told by the House of Representatives.

The coin redesign can go forward on its own track at an appropriate time and manner, and should. But today I think we have to approve this conference report so these five commemorative coins that are ready to go, can go. And we had the debate.

I am going to ask now for the yeas and nays on the conference report when the Senate comes back.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3337, the Omnibus Commemorative Coin Act. The measure contains several important bills that must be acted on expeditiously.

This act commemorates the 1994 World Cup soccer games, James Madison, and the 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights, the 200th anniversary of the laying of the first cornerstone of the White House, the quincentary of the discovery of the Americas, and the service of our Nation's Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf.

The act authorizes the minting of coins to commemorate these historic events. The proceeds from the sale of the coins will be used to fund significant programs. Proceeds from the World Cup commemorative coin will be used to promote and stage the 1994 World Cup Soccer games in the United States.

Proceeds from the White House commemorative coin will be used for furnishings and maintenance of the public rooms of the White House.

Proceeds from the Christopher Columbus commemorative coin will be used to provide scholarships for research and exploration.

Proceeds from the James Madison/Bill of Rights commemorative coin will be used to provide scholarships for the teachers for advanced studies in U.S. history and the Constitution.

I would like to take special note on the inclusion in this act of S. 1774, the silver medal for Persian Gulf veterans, which I sponsored and was cosponsored by 65 of my colleagues.

S. 1774 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to design and strike a silver medal for eligible medal for eligible members of the Armed Forces, and authorizes the striking of a replica medallion for the sale to the public.

The striking of the silver medallion would be at no cost to the taxpayer, as proceeds from the sales of the publicly sold replicas would fund the minting of the silver congressional medallions for our troops.

Mr. President, last year Congress authorized gold medals for Generals Powell and Schwarzkopf.

Having recognized these two great generals, it is only fitting that we pay similar respects to the troops who served under them in the Persian Gulf.

This legislation will authorize a silver medallion for the military men and women without whom the efforts of our Generals could not have succeeded.

Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm confirmed the U.S. military to be the best trained, best equipped, most fully capable armed forces in the world.

The American men and women who performed in the Persian Gulf served their country well and made us proud.

However, the sacrifices they endured were many and must not be forgotten. Indeed Mr. President, 141 Americans were killed in the Gulf conflict, paying the ultimate sacrifice to their country, and another 357 were wounded in action.

The long, exhausting hours in unfamiliar desert battle conditions, the trying period away from family and loved ones, and the ultimate sacrifice paid by our fallen and casualties deserve our acknowledgment.

Mr. President, the men and women of our Armed Forces are deserving of recognition and honor for their gallant efforts in the Persian Gulf conflict.

The offering of a commemorative silver medallion is one small way of demonstrating our national gratitude for their courageous service.

Let me close by emphasizing that if we defeat the conference report today we will be ending any chance we have of passing these commemoratives.

These commemoratives have already been delayed for over a year.

I support coin redesign and have tried to assist the senior Senator from California in his efforts to pass it.

However, it is clear that the House is not favorably inclined towards coin redesign at this time.

Having recently tried to pass it three times, the House Leadership has indicated it would "only serve to further delay passage of the time sensitive bills in the package and will effectively kill the legislation for this year.

I am hopeful that the House will reverse this position in the future, but we cannot delay acting on these important commemorative coins in the meantime.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on H.R. 3337.

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 3337, the White House commemorative coin bill. This bill has been debated for the last 6 months. It is time we pass this report and allow the mint to strike, produce, and market these coins. The White House Bicentennial commemorative and Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Commemorative coin programs are time sensitive. The Mint needs adequate leadtime to properly produce and market these coins in calendar year 1992 to mark these milestones.

According to a congressional Budget Office report, the coin programs in H.R. 3337 will result in a profit of $26 million to the government between 1992–95. Surcharges from the World Cup coin alone would generate between $30–40 million. These surcharges will be used to defray costs associated with hosting the games. The cities need the coin revenue to prepare the playing fields and stadiums for international competition, promote the games, and provide the necessary security for the players and the fans. The U.S. Department of commerce estimates that the tourism revenue to the United States from the world cup games at $1.5 billion. The delay in passing this legislation, has already forced the organizing committee to decrease the number of host cities from 12 to 9. These three cities have already lost out in sharing those tourism dollars. If this legislation is not enacted, these nine remaining host cities will be required to shoulder a larger burden of the cost, which could mean millions of dollars will be diverted from the city budgets that could be used for other worthwhile programs.

The World Cup coin bill along with the James Madison Foundation coin bill and the Christopher Columbus coin bill provides money for scholarship funds and educational programs. Many Americans will benefit from these different programs.

There have already been two conferences on this bill. The House passed the second conference report by a vote of 414–0. The House leadership has made is clear that they will not participate in a third conference. A vote by the senate to recommit this bill to conference is a vote to kill the coin package all together. It is uncertain whether other commemorative coin packages will be passed this Congress. This is not a partisan issue; billions of Americans will benefit from these programs, whether it is visiting the White House, attending any World Cup events, or receiving one of the numerous scholarships.

I, along with many of my colleagues, have been a supporter of coin redesign in the past, but that is no longer the issue with this bill. If we do not pass this conference report as is, then these five worthwhile programs will die and any pending coin bills are likely to be held up until the next Congress. The other body has made it clear that it will not consider coin redesign in any fashion and recommitting this legislation back to conference is saying that the senate wants to see these measures die. We can't let that happen.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise to support the White House Commemorative Coin Act, H.R. 3337, which will direct the U.S. Mint to strike five commemorative coins.

This legislation will commemorate five very important endeavors or events: First, the White House Bicentennial Commemorative Coin Act to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the White House. Proceeds from coin sales will be used for furnishing and maintenance of the White House. Second, Christopher Columbus quincentenary—these coins will commemorate the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America and proceeds will be used to finance scholarships for research and exploration. Third, the James Madison/Bill of Rights Bicentennial—these coins will commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights. Proceeds from the sales of these coins will be used to provide scholarships for teachers interested in pursuing constitutional studies. Fourth, the Persian Gulf Veterans Medals—silver medals will be minted to honor the men and women who served in the Persian Gulf conflict. The medals will be presented to the veterans. Fifth, the World Cup USA 1994 Commemorative Coin Act.

Everyone of these commemorative coins are very important and deserving of minting but there are two very important reasons why this legislation should be passed without delay: First, is the long overdue recognition to our Persian Gulf heroes. It has now been over a year since the Persian Gulf conflict ended and the Persian Gulf Veterans Medals honoring these men and women who served in the conflict have not been minted and bestowed upon these brave individuals. Second, the World Cup commemorative coin bill. This final coin is particularly important to California.

The United States was chosen for the first time in the history of the World Cup soccer games—the largest single sport event in the world—to host the games. These coins will commemorate this historic event and the proceeds from coin sales will be used to finance the games, help defray the costs of the local host cities and provide academic scholarships. This single event is estimated to increase direct tourism expenditures in the United States by $1.5 billion.

California has been fortunate as it has two sites—Stanford Stadium and Pasadena's Rose Bowl—which have been selected for the games. Alan Rothenberg, chairman of the World Cup organizing committee has estimated that this legislation will raise $40 million to help stage the World Cup in the United States.

Delay in passing the World Cup coin bill has cost U.S. cities millions in lost revenue. Due to uncertainty over passage of the World Cup coin bill, the World Cup USA Organizing Committee was forced to reduce from 12 to 9 the number of cities selected to host soccer games. This resulted in millions of dollars in lost economic activity to those cities not selected and will further cost the selected cities millions in operational costs unless revenues from the coin sales are realized.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and pass it without delay.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 3337, and it is my hope that we can pass this today and allow these efforts to go forward.

The bill before us would mint coins to commemorate our hosting of the 1994 World Cup in soccer, the quincentenary of Christopher Columbus' voyage to the Americas, the 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights, and the 200th anniversary of the White House. It would also mint long overdue medals to honor the men and women who served with such historic distinction in the Persian Gulf war.

It is my hope that these measures can be quickly passed. The commemoratives themselves are not controversial, and we are running out of time to get some of these coins minted. The Acting Director of the U.S. Mint has already written us to state that "if enactment is not forthcoming very soon, the mint will be severely limited in its ability to fully produce and market these coins"—that statement in particular refers to the White House coin and the Christopher Columbus coin.

These programs are 1992 programs we are almost in the fifth month of 1992,

and Columbus Day itself is only 5½ months away. So we do need to act promptly to pass this essentially noncontroversial legislation.

When I say noncontroversial I refer of course to the substance of the bill. I am of course well aware that there is a point of contention over whether we should include language in this legislation calling for a redesign of the tail sides of our circulating coinage.

I do not mean to take issue with those who are working for coin redesign. I admire them—each and every one. I have been a strong supporter of coin redesign, I would also note that many other supporters of coin redesign are nonetheless asking us to promptly pass this conference report. Our majority leader recently received a letter from House democratic leaders DICK GEPHARDT, DAVID BONIOR, and ESTEBAN TORRES, all advocates of coin redesign, which testified to the "unwillingness of the House to approve coin redesign in any form." Their letter continued, "it is our judgment that, despite our best efforts, a majority of the House will not support the redesign provision as part of the package. We believe that any efforts to reopen the conference will only serve to further delay passage of the time-sensitive bills in the package and will effectively kill the legislation for this year."

I do not think that anyone here wants to kill this legislation outright—rather, there is merely an honest, good-faith effort to enact legislation to redesign our coins. But the clear reality right now at the moment is that these worthy commemoratives, including among them silver medals to honor our distinguished veterans of the gulf conflict, will be jeopardized if we do not pass this legislation. That is the judgment of the Director of the U.S. Mint, and of the House leadership, and all of those in the best position to know.

I therefore ask my colleagues to lay aside their other valid concerns about coinage and to pass this conference report. By doing this we will get in just under the wire and have our beautiful coins minted in time for Columbus Day and these other national celebrations. I thank my colleagues and I yield the floor.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my support for the conference report to H.R. 3337, the Omnibus Commemorative Coin Act. This conference report contains a number of bills which, if enacted, would commemorate special events and help a number of worthwhile causes.

For the first time in history, the United States has been chosen to host the World Cup soccer games, the largest single sports event in the world. The city of Orlando will be one of these host cities. This event is estimated to increase direct tourism expenditures in the United States by $1.5 billion.

One provision of the conference report would authorize the Mint to design and produce coins commemorating this event. The proceeds from the World Cup coins authorized by this legislation would be used to finance the games, help defray the costs of the local host cities and to provide academic scholarships.

Congressional delay and uncertainty concerning the fate of the World Cup coin bill has already caused the World Cup USA Organizing Committee to reduce the number of host cities from 12 to 9. While Orlando still receives the benefits of being a host to the World Cup, other Florida cities may have lost their chance to host an event when the field was reduced from 12 cities to 9. This delay and uncertainty cost the cities not selected millions of dollars in lost economic activity, and will further cost the selected cities millions in operational costs unless revenues from the coin sales are realized.

We must not delay passage of this bill any longer. I urge my colleagues to join me, without delay, in supporting this bill.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, we have had our debate on this issue. The time for debate has expired.

I ask unanimous consent to proceed for as much as 10 additional minutes on a separate subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, in light of the fact that both parties will be meeting for caucus purposes shortly, I will try to use less than the full amount of time I just asked for, but I want to take note of some important economic data that has come across the news wires this morning.

Let me begin by noting an item from the AP news wire that the U.S. economy grew. I am going to quote the first few paragraphs of this wire story this morning.

> The U.S. economy grew at a modest 2 percent annual rate during the first three months of the year boosted by the return of buyers to auto showrooms, * * * the government said today.
>
> Economists warned that the growth in the gross domestic product which followed a near economic standstill in the fourth quarter of last year, was not vigorous enough to budge the Nation's unemployment rate from a 6.5-year high of 7.3 percent in March.
>
> Separately, the Commerce Department reported a worrisome 14.8 percent seasonally adjusted drop in new home sales in March; the steepest in 10 years. It followed a 7 percent decline in February.

Now dropping down in that story, it says that in terms of this modest 2-percent growth rate in the first quarter that:

> The January-March rise was aided by a boom in mortgage refinancings, which put hundreds of dollars in many consumers' pockets and by an increase in early Federal tax refunds, the result of a rise in computerized filings.
>
> However, analysts warned that the economic upturn will not last unless employers have enough confidence in the future to start rehiring laid-off workers.

I think that is the critical issue, getting people back to work in this country.

I have not seen a later stock market update as the day has gone along, but the one I am now going to cite is the early one this morning, during the first half hour of trading which was the initial response of the stock market to this economic news. Obviously, there will be other news during the day and the market will rise and fall for whatever reasons. After digesting the initial economic news, however, the market was off and it indicated in the analysis—I will not read it—that the economic data just was not that strong.

The President was asked about it. I have just one other AP news item here. I am going to assume this is an accurate quotation, although sometimes these quotations are put together very rapidly and so sometimes they are accurate and sometimes they are not.

Assuming this one is accurate today also from the AP wire, when the President was quizzed by news people this morning about whether the recession was over, he said:

> "Most people would say that 2-percent growth is not recessionary. There are some areas that are still hurting. But clearly, this is a good sign and there are a lot of other good signs" said Bush at a meeting with Republican law makers. "Most people that I talk to * * * feel that things are getting better." Then he concludes: "I just hope it continues."

I read that and thought to myself about the problems we are dealing with, unemployment, 9.3 percent in Michigan, and new home sales down, the steepest drop in 10 years. I have all kinds of people in my State and the other 49 States who cannot find work now who are unemployed. I got a letter from a fellow the other day who has been through three different job retraining programs and still cannot find a job. Even though he has been trained in three different areas, he still cannot find work, and that is a problem throughout the country and what this news story indicates.

It is not enough for the President, a friend of mine now over a quarter of a century, and I prize the friendship and want to maintain the friendship, but it is not enough for the President to say, "I just hope it continues." That is like a spectator; that is like somebody who is sitting up maybe 70, 80 rows in the stadium watching something that is going down on the field and saying, "I hope things go a certain way."

The President is the quarterback of the economic team of America. It is his

59-059 O—96 Vol. 138 (Pt. 7) 27

job to see that things get stronger, not to hope that they get stronger, but to call the signals to see that it will get stronger. We recently passed an economic recovery program and a tax program designed to get this economy moving faster. We sent it down to the President not very long ago. It passed the House and the Senate. We sent it down to the White House and the President vetoed that bill.

In that bill were a number of things that the President, himself, had asked for to try to stimulate the economy. There has not been anything since that time. And so we are missing the stimulative economic effect that could help create jobs in America, from the tax bill that we did pass that the President vetoed. So we have to have more action. We have to have more leadership. We have to get going in terms of a strategy that can get America moving at a faster rate.

The administration is certainly willing to take the initiative for other countries. They have come in here with an economic plan for Mexico called the fast track trade effort with Mexico designed to create jobs in Mexico. They have come in here with a plan to help Kuwait. They came in here the other day with an economic plan for, of all countries, Communist China. They were in here for the most-favored-nation trading status to help the Chinese, if you can believe it, to increase their economic performance. Of course the Chinese are shipping a lot of their goods to the United States. They have a huge trade surplus with us. They are draining billions of dollars out of the United States. And so the President and his people were working day and night to get the Congress to agree to give most-favored-nation trading status to, of all people, Communist China.

But is there an economic plan for America? None to be seen. What are the elements that ought to be in it? We need a national health insurance plan to get health costs under control for companies, businesses, individuals, families, and also make sure that people out there can have some manner of health insurance coverage so we do not have 40 million people who have no coverage at all.

Is there a Presidential plan on health care? None to be found. None to be seen. No plan in that area. That is a way to help the economy. We have all this cost shifting going on today, tremendous inefficiency in that system, and that is an area where it is not a question of hoping that things will get better. That is an area where only direct and forceful action will make things get better.

The same thing in the trade area. Japan continues to cheat us in trade. They are taking out of the United States over $40 billion a year. They took out $43 billion last year, a lot of it with trade cheating. They keep their market closed in Japan. They dump goods in the United States below cost, and they end up sucking $43 billion last year out of the United States. They are taking out an additional $3½ billion every month.

The President could do something about that. He likes foreign policy. He could pick up the telephone and tell the Japanese Prime Minister that that has to change. Apparently, we cannot muster that kind of an initiative within the administration. It is regrettable because that phone call needs to be made and that would help this economy, and then we would be able to see stronger growth numbers in the United States and we would see more Americans going back to work.

These are some of the areas where we need a response. We need a more aggressive economic strategy.

I must say, I saw the polling data the other day down in the State of Texas—very interesting. In Texas, the President is running second in the Presidential polling data. Who is he running second to? Another Texan, in this case Ross Perot. What is Ross Perot saying? He is saying we ought to try to do something about getting the economy going, that we ought to work day and night to try to get the job base growing.

The other candidate for President, in the Democratic Party, Governor Clinton, is saying the same thing. And down there in that particular State people who presumably know President Bush very well, because it is his home State, and Mr. Perot very well are saying they are so dissatisfied with the leadership they are willing to cash in the President and take Mr. Perot.

Now, these are just the folks in Texas. Why are they saying that? Because there is no economic plan for America. Yes, there is an economic plan in the administration for Mexico, for parts of the old Soviet Union, for Communist China, for Kuwait. You name the country, the administration has a plan.

They were in here the other day with a plan for Thailand. No plan for America. America needs a plan. We have veterans of Desert Storm today, people who were being honored with parades, and justly so, a year ago, who are now unemployed and homeless.

There was a story the other night on national television of two Desert Storm veterans living in cardboard boxes because they cannot find work. That is not right. We do not have to have our country in that situation.

But the President, with all due respect, has to do more than say I just hope the economy gets stronger. He has to get out of the stands, come down on the field, put on a uniform, and start calling the signals. This is what the country wants. If he is not prepared to do that in an aggressive way, that puts people back to work and really gets this economy humming, then he is going to be out of work. He is going to be out of work because people want change and they want this economy to get moving, and rightly so.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

The Senator from North Carolina should be advised that all time has expired. There is a previous order to recess.

Mr. HELMS. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are talking about who is to blame for what, let me make a few comments. I make these comments every day updating the statistics. So here we go.

Mr. President, the Federal debt run up by the U.S. Congress stood at $3,879,888,608,005.53, as of the close of business on Friday, April 24, 1992.

As anybody familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows, no President can spend a dime that has not first been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

During the past fiscal year, it cost the American taxpayers $286,022,000,000 just to pay the interest on spending approved by Congress—over and above what the Federal Government collected in taxes and other income. Averaged out, this amounts to $5.5 billion every week, or $785 million every day.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child owes $15,105.13—thanks to the big-spenders in Congress for the past half century. Paying the interest on this massive debt, averaged out, amounts to $1,127.85 per year for each man, woman and child in America—or, to look at it another way, for each family of four, the tab—to pay the interest alone—comes to $4,511.40 per year.

What would America be like today if there had been a Congress that had the courage and the integrity to operate on a balanced budget?

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:43 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. ADAMS].

WHITE HOUSE COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The business of the Senate is the question on agreeing to the conference report on H.R. 3337. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 81 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Akaka	Domenici	Mack
Baucus	Durenberger	McConnell
Bentsen	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Garn	Mitchell
Bond	Glenn	Murkowski
Boren	Gore	Nickles
Bradley	Gorton	Nunn
Brown	Graham	Packwood
Bryan	Gramm	Pressler
Bumpers	Grassley	Riegle
Burdick	Hatch	Robb
Burns	Hatfield	Roth
Byrd	Heflin	Rudman
Chafee	Helms	Sarbanes
Coats	Jeffords	Sasser
Cochran	Kassebaum	Seymour
Cohen	Kasten	Shelby
Conrad	Kerrey	Simpson
Craig	Kerry	Smith
D'Amato	Kohl	Stevens
Danforth	Lautenberg	Symms
Daschle	Leahy	Thurmond
Dixon	Levin	Wallop
Dodd	Lott	Warner
Dole	Lugar	Wirth

NAYS—22

Adams	Hollings	Reid
Bingaman	Johnston	Rockefeller
Breaux	Kennedy	Sanford
Cranston	Lieberman	Simon
DeConcini	Metzenbaum	Wellstone
Exon	Moynihan	Wofford
Fowler	Pell	
Harkin	Pryor	

NOT VOTING—3

Inouye	McCain	Specter

So the conference report on H.R. 3337 was agreed to.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, was leaders' time reserved this morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Leaders' time was reserved.

SYRIA LIFTS RESTRICTIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I want to join President Bush and others in welcoming the decision by the Government of Syria to lift longstanding restrictions on the Jewish population of Syria.

These onerous restrictions—which effectively precluded freedom of travel, and the holding of property—represented gross violations of the human rights of Syrian Jews. They were offensive to anyone who believes in freedom and fairness. They were a blot on the face of the Syrian regime.

This is an issue that many of us in the Congress have been working on for a long time. Two years ago in Damascus, I raised this matter directly with President Assad.

At long last, the Syrian regime has done what is right.

Hopefully, this decision will have a positive impact not only on those directly affected, but will also improve the atmosphere for the ongoing Middle East peace negotiations.

Peace and justice in the Middle East is still a long way off. But this decision represents one more small but important step forward in pursuit of that goal.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator reserves the remainder of his leader time.

Mr. BOREN addressed the Chair.

SENATE ELECTION ETHICS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate a report of the committee of conference on S. 3, the Congressional Campaign Spending Limit and Election Reform Act of 1992 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits for Senate election campaigns, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of April 8, 1992.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to bring to the floor the conference report on S. 3, the Congressional Campaign Spending Limit and Election Reform Act of 1992. For almost a decade now, each Congress has come a step closer to enacting meaningful campaign finance reform. Many said that such a sweeping campaign reform bill would never make it this far. Clearly, they were wrong.

The outstanding leadership of many individuals in this Chamber, an effort that began, as I indicated, almost a decade ago, involving at that time, along with current Members of the leadership, bipartisan leadership of Members like Senator Goldwater, Senator Stennis, and others, continuing on with the leadership in this Chamber of majority leader Senator MITCHELL; Senator FORD, the chairman of the Rules Committee; the distinguished President pro tempore, Senator BYRD; and many others, we now have the opportunity to send to the President the most comprehensive campaign finance reform measure passed since Watergate. This bill will replace the power of the pocketbook with the power of the American voter. We have traveled a long journey. But the end of the journey is finally in sight. We must succeed.

The conference agreement, almost without exception, maintains the strong provisions of the campaign finance reform bill that passed this Chamber nearly a year ago. In every important way, we meet the goals propounded in the Senate bill. These goals include reforming the system to encourage citizen involvement at the grassroots level, reforming the system to encourage and promote political competition with a focus on the issues and on substance rather than on rewarding only those who can raise the most money.

It is time for us to have competition in American politics based upon ideas, based upon which candidate is best qualified, based upon the proposals of the candidates for solving the serious problems facing this country instead of having elections fought more and more on the question of which candidate can raise the most money in his or her campaign fund.

Third, this proposal will reform the system by crafting a comprehensive solution which guarantees that the millions of special-interest dollars spent on campaigns are eliminated from the system for good, instead of just popping up somewhere else in the political process after being squeezed out of one area that we might target.

The conference agreement is in line with the Senate-passed bill and achieves these goals. First, the agreement is premised on a set of benefits that will be provided if a candidate ac-

cepts voluntary spending limits. The current system has made us part-time Members of Congress, part-time Senators, and full-time fundraisers. To win a seat in the Senate today, you need to spend nearly $4 million. That is exactly the average spent by candidates who won U.S. Senate races in the last election cycle: $4 million, on the average; not in the largest States, but an average-size State. It means that a successful candidate has to raise an average of almost $15,000 each week, each and every week for 6 years, in order to come up with the average amount of money that a winning candidate spent in the last election cycle.

In the 1990 election, Senate candidates raised almost a quarter of a billion dollars to run successfully for office. Mr. President, enough is enough. With the serious problems that we have facing this country, it is time to allow the Members of Congress to concentrate on solving those problems, on doing the job that the people elected them to do, instead of forcing them to spend so much time raising more and more and more money in order to run successful election campaigns.

Moreover, this expensive system not only takes the attention of Members and candidates for office off the issues and away from solving the problems to the need to raise money, it also favors incumbents and discourages new candidates who can bring fresh ideas to Congress. In race after race, incumbents outspend challengers.

In the 1990 senatorial election, only one challenger defeated an incumbent, the lowest number of successful challengers since 1960. The only lasting and effective way to fix this system is to place reasonable limits on how much money those running for office may spend. The American people overwhelmingly favor spending limits in elections. In recent surveys, between 77 and 85 percent of all Americans—all Americans of both political parties, Democrats and Republicans alike—favor spending limits. The conference committee agreement mirrors the Senate bill in accomplishing this objective of imposing spending limits.

In accordance with the U.S. Supreme Court decision, which requires that any spending limit system be voluntary, it establishes a voluntary system under which expenditures are capped based on the voting age population of a candidate's State.

Opponents of this bill cry that spending limits would hurt challengers. This unsupported statement does not reflect the realities of this bill. We must look at facts and not fiction. For example, if spending limits imposed in S. 3 had been in place in the 1990 Senate election, 82 percent of the incumbents who ran last time would have exceeded the spending limit by an average of almost $2 million, compared with only 32 percent of the challengers, who have exceeded the limit by an average of only $400,000.

The facts are clear. Incumbents, time after time, again without regard to whether those incumbents are Democrats or Republicans, can simply raise more money than challengers. They occupy positions of authority and have the ability to influence important policy decisions which affect powerful interest groups in this country. And because they occupy those positions and because those interest groups want access to those incumbents, they are in a better position to raise money if money is going to be the determining element in the outcome of campaigns in this country.

And so it is not surprising that on the average, incumbents were able to outspend challengers in Senate races by about 3 to 1 and in House races by about 8 to 1 in the last election cycle. It is not surprising, therefore, that incumbents would have exceeded the spending limits, 82 percent of them, if S. 3 had been in effect in the 1990 election cycle.

The truth is that with spending limits, challengers will now finally have a chance to compete in the election process. And as long as we have no spending limits—runaway spending without control—it is going to be the rare challengers, indeed, who will have a chance to raise even close to as much money as a sitting incumbent in any election campaign.

Mr. President, spending limits are not just important to campaign finance reform; they are fundamental to campaign finance reform. Campaign reform without spending limits is like telling the doctor you can examine the patient, but you certainly cannot cure the disease or treat the disease.

Second, the conference agreement eliminates the disproportionate influence of political action committees. In 1990, PAC's contributed more than $130 million to campaigns. These PAC's know how to play the Washington power game. They gave $16 to House incumbents for every $1 given to challengers, and they gave to Senate incumbents versus challengers by more than 8 to 1; $16 by the political action committees given to incumbents for every $1 that they gave to challengers.

This margin for Senate incumbents has risen for the 1992 election to more than 15 to 1, and the ratio so far in this election cycle for House races is 25 to 1. So instead of the problem becoming less serious, the problem grows worse by the day. How long, Mr. President, are we going to wait until we do something about it? Already political action committees, giving $16 to incumbents in the House versus $1 to challengers, is now increasing to $25 to $1. Are we going to wait until it is $50 to every incumbent to every $1 to a challenger; $100? How long are we going to wait, Mr. President? How long are we going to wait to curb special interest influence in American politics? How long are we going to wait, Mr. President, to bring campaign spending under control? How long are we going to wait?

When I first came to U.S. Senate in the election cycle of 1978, the average winning candidate for the U.S. Senate spent $600,000 getting elected. That was only 14 years ago; $600,000. The last election cycle was $4 million. Are we going to wait until it is $8 million; $16 million? Where is it going to end, Mr. President? How long are we going to let this situation continue before we act?

The conference report on S. 3 gives us a chance to take that historic step. We are the trustees of this institution. We have an opportunity to vote on this legislation. We are the only ones who have an opportunity to vote on this legislation, and therefore it gives us a heavy responsibility to do what is right as trustees of the process for the American people.

It is time for us to seize this opportunity to put our own house in order, to begin to reform this institution, and there is nothing more fundamental to the reform of the institution of the U.S. Congress than assuring we have an election process that belongs to the people instead of to the power of the dollar contributed by special interest groups.

Clearly, the disproportionate influence of political action committees must be eliminated to allow incumbents and challengers to compete on a level playing field. Conferees, recognizing the constitutional limitations on a complete political action committee ban—that is a matter that has been raised during debate when we had the bill before us before. It is a matter also raised by the White House in making some of their proposals.

I think there has been broad understanding of the potential constitutional issues on both sides of the aisle. In light of that, the conference committee decided not to prohibit entirely the ability of political action committees to contribute, but instead curtailed strictly the ability of PAC's to give in congressional elections. The conference agreement provides that a candidate would be limited to receiving no more than 20 percent of the election-cycle limit in aggregate political action committee contributions, and the maximum political action committee contribution or PAC contribution for Senate candidates will be cut in half, from $5,000 to $2,500 per election.

These measures would significantly decrease the disproportionate influence of PAC's on Senate candidates. If the 20-percent aggregate PAC limit without the individual PAC limit had been in effect in 1990, the amount of money incumbents could have raised from political action committees would have been cut by more than half, 53 percent.

And so, Mr. President, this bill goes a long way in the right direction to reduce by more than half the amount of money that political action committees did pour into the process in the election cycle just ended in 1990.

Third, the conference agreement adopts the Senate language and stops the flow of what has been called soft money, or sewer money, into American politics. The sewer money comes from huge contributions from wealthy individuals and organizations, such as unions and corporations and others, funneled through political parties. This distortion of the political process must be stopped. As we approach the upcoming Presidential election, we will likely see over $100 million or more in soft money pumped into the system to alter the course of Federal elections.

Mr. President, we have seen this happen in the Presidential system, for example, where we have adopted a system that supposedly was going to squeeze special interest money out of the process. And now, through the loophole of allowing people to pass money through the political parties, State party organizations, for example, in a move to influence Federal elections without spending limits, have actually had fundraisers where people have given up to $100,000 each to be funneled through this loophole for the purpose of influencing Federal elections, including Presidential elections, under a system that was supposed to totally remove special interest funding and funding from wealthy individuals in an undue amount.

Mr. President, it is time to stop it. People across this country who have studied the election system have called for stopping it. And this conference committee, once and for all, has adopted a proposal that will do just that.

Fourth, the conference agreement would also halt another abuse, bundling, for example, the object of many recent press reports, even in the last few days. Special interest groups are skirting the law through so-called independent expenditures.

Further, the conference agreement follows the Senate-passed bill in improving the quality of the debate. The benefits for accepting the voluntary spending limits include broadcast vouchers which can be used for television and radio. On all such advertisements, candidates must claim responsibility to ensure the presence of clear fingerprints on negative attack advertising.

Mr. President, nothing has been more discouraging or disgusting than to see the course of recent campaigns during which time we have seen a large number of advertisements carried in the media, 30-second spots attacking other candidates, not trying to talk about what a candidate wants to do to help the country, but making negative personal attacks on the opposition and then not even claiming credit for these attacks. Actors are usually used in these broadcast spots so that the candidate himself or herself can avoid responsibility for making such negative attacks on the opposition.

So under this bill, Mr. President, no longer will a candidate be able to hire actors to make personal attacks on 30-second spots without having to assume responsibility himself or herself. The candidate will have to be shown on the end of the advertisement claiming responsibility for the ad.

And hopefully, Mr. President, there is enough sense of personal honor and integrity that there will be enough hesitation on the part of candidates to keep them from wanting to assume responsibility for such negative advertising, and they will again turn back to discussing the issues, to talking about what they want to do to serve their country, instead of wasting the voters' time on negative attacks on the opponents that they face during an election campaign.

Contrary to the statements of a few Members of Congress, this bill does not commit any public resources to financing any part of the congressional campaign.

Because the conference vehicle is a Senate bill, it cannot provide funding until subsequent funding legislation is passed. However, the conference agreement also provides for a resolution that subsequent funding legislation shall not provide for any general revenue increase, reduced expenditures for any existing Federal program, or an increase in the Federal budget deficit in order to fund those incentives necessary to a bill under the Supreme Court decision to impose spending limits.

The conference agreement contains almost all of the Senate bill that was the product of extensive debate on both sides of the aisle. I recall that Senators, including Senator DANFORTH, the Senator from Missouri, proposed the broadcast voucher system, a system of broadcast vouchers be included.

Many Senators on the other side of the aisle have targeted the cost of campaigns as a goal of true reform. Through our reduced mailing and broadcast rates we have incorporated this concern. In fact, it was Senator RUDMAN who convinced me that we should not only allow candidates to receive the lowest unit broadcast rate, they should be able to buy advertisements at less than that rate, half that rate, as provided in the bill.

Although the conference agreement, like the Senate bill preceding it, surely will not please all 100 Members of our Chamber, it is a program for real reform. What is certain is that we must quickly press forward with this solid reform bill. We cannot afford to sit and watch our system decay further while the American people continue to lose faith in this institution.

Mr. President, this agreement is real reform. The conference agreement reflects the Senate-passed bill in every substantive area of reform. Writers and public interest groups who have worked to reform the process have unanimously heralded this bill as fundamental reform. The New York Times calls it landmark legislation and suggests that the President should sign it. The Los Angeles times dubbed it "the best chance the country has had in years to pull itself back from the brink of political despair."

These are just a sample of the dozens of editorials in newspapers from all parts of the country that uniformly emphasize the need for true campaign finance reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of editorials from the Washington Post, the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, and many others, the Sacramento Bee; Fort Worth Star-Telegram; San Jose Mercury News; the Huntington, WV, Herald Dispatch; the Wichita Eagle, of Wichita, KS; the Plain Dealer, of Cleveland; and several other newspapers, the Miami Herald, Miami, FL; the Hartford Courant, Hartford, CT; and the Reno Gazette-Journal, of Reno, NV, among others be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 8, 1992]

WHY VETO THIS TERRIFIC REFORM?

Some time before the end of this month, the most important campaign reform legislation in a generation will be offered to President Bush for his signature. Bush has sworn to veto the reform. In our judgment, a veto would harm both parties and, worse, would wreck the best chance the country has to turn the current, almost suicidal pessimism of the electorate into a renewal of hope.

The real political news of the last six months has not been the rising and falling and rising fortunes of Bill Clinton or Jerry Brown or Pat Buchanan or George Bush. It has been the falling, falling and further falling level of popular interest in the nation's electoral process itself. The cure for democracy cannot be less democracy; but less democracy is just what you get when so many eligible voters just give up and stay home. Past a certain point, non-participation becomes a crisis of legitimacy for American democracy itself.

Root of Evil: The candidates accuse one another of bringing the nation to this crisis, but notice how the accusation is framed. The term of accusatory art is special interests as in "my opponent is captive to the special interests." What makes special interests bad, of course, is that they are pursued against the general interest, but how does a candidate fall into this special-interest captivity?

The bars of the cage are made of money. Buying votes is bribery, and illegal, but buying access, buying influence, buying returned phone calls—all this is "politics as usual." What the candidates say about their opponents guilt is the unpleasant truth. What they imply about their own innocence is a stinking lie, and that's a good part of the reason Americans are tuning out their own

political system. The whole thing is starting to stink.

A generation ago, with the foul aroma of Watergate still on our presidential politics, the United States instituted limits on presidential fund raising. The reform consisted, in broad terms, of a limit on contributions by individuals and political action committees joined to a program of public funding. As a result of this reform, President Bush has received a total of $145 million in public funds for his campaigns for the vice presidency and the presidency.

Root of Reform: The legislation the President has sworn to veto extends this reform to House and Senate races. The reform does not, as he claims, favor incumbents over challengers. Under the present, unreformed system, incumbents raise vastly more money than challengers. A Times study found, moreover, that only 80 House candidates in 1990 spent more than the $600,000 limit that the reform permits. The reform does not increase taxes. Though it limits PAC contributions it does not eliminate them. It improves on the reform of presidential campaign spending by strictly limiting so-called soft-money contributions to political parties.

It is, in short, the best chance the country has had in years to pull itself back from the brink of political despair. President Bush should not just sign this legislation, he should applaud it. We are cheered by the rumor that a group of junior Republicans may soon give him the same advice.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 6, 1992]

MR. BUSH ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE

President Bush made another selfserving speech the other day about the need for congressional reform just as the Democrats were wrapping up the year's most important reform bill—which the president has promised to veto. The bill would shift the debate from the entertaining subjects of the House Bank, House Post Office and which branch has the most egregious perks to the fundamental issues of how much it costs to get to Congress, and who pays.

The price of office has been allowed to rise too high. The average Senate seat now costs about $4 million; the average House seat, about $375,000. To raise what it needs to run for reelection, Congress as a whole now collects an average of more than $2.7 million in campaign contributions every week of every year. Seats are bought in this system, even if members are not. Members spend too much time begging; too much money comes from PACs, the giving arms of the interest groups with business before the members whom they choose to support. In the House the system is worse in that, thanks to the PACs, many senior members particularly are easily able to raise more than they spend; the carryover is used to discourage future challengers.

In most recent years this system has produced Democratic majorities; the Democrats would nonetheless change it. Their bill, which not all of them like, would establish voluntary spending limits, provide partial public funding or its equivalent in kind to candidates (challengers as well as incumbents) who comply with them, make some other healthy changes in the mix of funds to reduce the influence of PACs and try to prevent evasions, particularly in the form of "soft money"—campaign contributions meant to support federal candidates but laundered through state parties to avoid the federal ceilings.

Our own notion is that the bill would help challengers (and thereby Republicans) more than incumbents. The Republicans nonetheless resist in part on grounds that challengers must often outspend their rivals to win. The president says that he will veto a bill combining spending limits and partial public finance. He professes to be opposed to both features in part on principle, even as he himself is about to become the all-time leading recipient of public funds in federal elections. As vice presidential candidate in 1980 and 1984 and presidential candidate thereafter, he will have accepted some $200 million in public funds in return for abiding by spending limits. What rubbery principle is that?

The president wants it understood that, whatever the nation's accumulation of problems during the past 12 years, the executive branch was not at fault. If it's bad, the corpulent Democratic Congress did it; that's the theme—and Congress has rarely been an easier target than now.

But as this very bill again attests, that's only a partial picture. Mr. Bush has been a reactive president; Congress has often been the forcing branch. He is trying here to create a self-fulfilling prophecy: to blame the Congress even as he blocks the reform. The Democrats are right to pass this bill. If he vetoes it, the corrupting system that it seeks to replace is at his doorstep.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1992]

DEMOCRACY AND HYPOCRISY

President Bush, seizing on the public's contempt for Congress, now casts himself as an ardent government reformer, committed to cleaning up a "broken" political system. But that's a stretch, even for a politician caught with his polls down in the midst of a tough re-election fight. Beyond the partisan posturing, Mr. Bush shows little real interest in fixing things.

He rightly calls for streamlining the Congressional committee system and its budget process. But Congressional leaders are already pushing to create a partisan committee to examine such changes. And on the central reform issue facing Congress—its corrupt system of campaign financing—Mr. Bush is the main obstacle to fundamental change.

Landmark legislation that would finally slow the endless pursuit of favor-seeking money by the nation's top lawmakers and the special treatment it buys has cleared a House-Senate conference committee and is headed for the House floor.

The measure, backed by the Senate majority leader, George Mitchell, and House Speaker Thomas Foley, would create a less incumbent-protective system of spending limits, new curbs on special-interest political action committees (PAC's) and sensible public financing.

The bill isn't perfect. But it would be a breathtaking departure from the discredited business-as-usual that keeps lawmakers beholden to favor-seekers and keeps challengers at bay. Mr. Bush says he wants a cleaner, more competitive system. Yet he threatens to veto the bill when it arrives on his desk because it contains spending limits and public financing.

Mr. Bush, like most Congressional Republicans, resists spending limits, saying they would hurt challengers. But the argument simply doesn't hold when few House challengers can raise enough money to run a realistically competitive race.

The President's opposition to public financing is even more troubling. In a speech Friday at Philadelphia's Independence Hall, Mr. Bush asserted that "Federal funding of Congressional elections would only make the problem worse." But how? The President doesn't say.

If the influence of favor-seekers is to be reduced, and the playing field leveled for challengers, candidates need access to clean resources. The constitutionally dubious step Mr. Bush proposes, abolishing the corporate and union PAC's that give predominantly to Democrats (but not "ideological" PAC's that tend to favor Republicans), won't do the job. Nor is a 12-year term limit a good answer. It would purge good legislators and bad while inflating the influence of staff and lobbyists.

Mr. Bush's opposition to public financing is awkward and ungrateful. Mr. Bush will have run in four publicly financed Presidential campaigns by November. He will have received the benefit of more than $200 million in public campaign money—making him the nation's all-time public-financing champ. That alone ought to give Mr. Bush pause before lifting his veto pen.

Among its other big advantages, the Congressional campaign finance bill would close the loophole in the Presidential system that saw Mr. Bush's 1988 campaign hustle $100,000 contributions from some of the nation's wealthiest people to help the national campaign.

The President who's trying to woo voters by wearing the cloak of reform would look a lot less selfish, and a lot more sincere, if he changed his mind and signed the bill.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Apr. 9, 1992]

TONIC FOR AN AILING CONGRESS

Salivating over the House check-writing scandal, his moistened finger lifted bravely to the wind, President Bush, like so many others in this election season, is running against Congress. In that vein, he has endorsed the dangerous congressional quick fix of term limits. At the same time, the president promises to veto the one good piece of legislation that has a chance of reducing the special-interest grip on Congress and making the institution more responsive to the electorate.

A campaign-finance reform bill designed to slow the congressional money chase cleared a House-Senate conference committee last week. Its key elements are voluntary spending limits and limited public financing of congressional campaigns. Under the legislation, candidates for the House of Representatives who accepted public financing could spend no more than $600,000 per election cycle. Spending limits for Senate candidates who accepted public funds would vary from $1.5 million to $8.2 million, depending on the size of the state.

The bill was approved on a straight party-line vote, with all Republicans voting "no." They fear that spending limits will hurt challengers, most of whom are Republicans, while helping better-known incumbents, mostly Democrats. It's a groundless fear: The history of political campaigns has shown that challengers don't need huge amounts of money to win, just enough to run credible campaigns. Practically every incumbent defeated in the last congressional election cycle spent more than his opponent.

Congressional Republicans and Bush also object to public financing, dismissing it derisively as "welfare for the politicians." It's an odd objection coming from a politician who, as a two-time candidate for vice president and a three-time candidate for president, has received nearly $150 million in public campaign funds.

The bill approved last week is not the perfect remedy for what ails Congress, but if it

becomes law it can reduce the obscene sums spent on election campaigns. And it would give those candidates who wish to avoid both the appearance and the reality of being bought and paid for by wealthy special interests a clean source of campaign funds. What's wrong with that?

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Mar. 31, 1992]

THE REAL PROBLEM: NOT PERKS, BUT CAMPAIGN-FINANCE ABUSE

Ah, those congressional perks—perquisites of office, defined as things expected but incidental to employment. In the case of the House, it means free reserved parking where others pay, free prescription drugs, a low-cost private gym and discount haircuts. It used to mean the freedom to write bad checks.

The public is right to demand an accounting, and an end, to these privileges of office. For that matter, it is also right to review and kill some perks (limousine service, for instance) enjoyed by executive-branch functionaries. Arrogant and assumed privilege is questionable whether it is enjoyed by an elected representative, an assistant secretary of something or the president's chief of staff.

But no revelations about House members' abuse of privilege, or even needed efforts to trim back those privileges, should be allowed to obscure the real iceberg—of money—that threatens our system of representative government.

This week, House and Senate conferees start work sorting out slightly different versions of campaign-finance reform bills. Each house wrote its own, not presuming to tell the other how to act. The House-Senate conference hopes to produce one bill acceptable to both before the spring congressional recess April 10.

This work is much more important than the flap about perks. It is more important than all the jingoism about term limitations.

Money really is the mother's milk of politics. No member of Congress ever voted against the public interest because he had gotten a cheap haircut or because she had written a bad check at the House bank, but such votes are bound to occur when representatives and senators spend most of their time cultivating campaign contributions and kowtowing to backers with deep pockets.

Conferees may come up with different rules for House and Senate in order to free candidates from begging for money. The conferees may recommend public financing of campaigns. They surely will try to set some caps on campaign spending.

Wish them luck, and hope the president doesn't veto the product without excellent and non-partisan reason. This really is important work—important not just to the politicians but to every American citizen.

[From the San Jose Mercury News, Dec. 2, 1991]

HOPE FOR REFORM

Approval in the House of Representatives of campaign finance reform last week offers more hope that Congress may kick its addiction to special-interest money.

Earlier this year, the Senate passed a strong campaign reform measure. Now the two versions must be reconciled in conference committee.

One impediment to reform will be President Bush, who has said he will veto any measure that includes spending limits and public subsidies.

Without them, there will be no meaningful reform.

The Supreme Court has ruled that spending limits are unconstitutional, except when made a condition of receiving public funding for campaigns.

Spending limits are essential, because the fear of being outspent is what drives incumbents to raise money throughout their terms in office. The wallets they reach into usually belong to businesses and interest groups with a major stake in the outcome of legislation.

Campaign reform without spending limits becomes an endless attempt to limit contributions, which, by itself, is doomed to fail. If candidates feel they need more money and they are allowed to spend it, they will find it someplace.

The House bill has three major provisions. Total spending would be voluntary limited to $600,000. Candidates could receive only $200,000 from political action committees. And candidates who agree to the spending limit would be eligible for $200,000 in public funds.

Republicans claim the bill would cripple challengers. The argument is baffling. Incumbents—and in Congress, most incumbents are Democrats—enjoy huge fund-raising advantages. Spending limits and public funds blunt that advantage.

The Senate approach to reform is similar to the House's, with one important addition. The Senate would ban so-called "soft money," contributions in amounts as high as $100,000 given to parties, not directly to candidates. Especially in presidential and senatorial contests, where the party has only one candidate, this is a loophole big enough to accommodate a Charles Keating.

Public funding of campaigns is often criticized as forcing the public to pay for yet another congressional perk. That criticism is foolishly shortsighted.

Campaigns will be financed somehow. The current method is that agricultural interests disproportionately underwrite the campaigns of representatives and senators on agricultural committees, and banking and savings and loan interests contribute heavily to members on the banking committees.

Compare the hundreds of billions of dollars spent bailing out savings and loans with the cost of subsidizing campaigns.

[From the Huntington (WV) Herald-Dispatch, Jan. 4, 1992]

CAMPAIGN GIFTS: IT'S TIME FOR A STRONG REFORM LAW

When the bills are added up, the near-collapse of the nation's savings and loan industry seems a cinch to be the largest financial scandal in American history. It's estimated that the S&L debacle will cost U.S. taxpayers about $500 billion—or $4,600 for every taxpayer.

Let there be no mistake about it: The S&L scandal never would have taken place if the federal government's regulatory machinery had been allowed to function. But powerful congressmen put enough pressure on regulators that they couldn't do their jobs.

That pressure didn't just happen. It was a direct result of the $11 million in campaign contributions that financier Charles Keating and others in the S&L industry funneled to key lawmakers in Washington.

Now that the S&L mess has been exposed to the light of day, members of the public have no problem seeing the obvious connection between the big-bucks donations by Keating and others and failure of the federal government to properly police the industry.

Little wonder that a recent New York Times/CBS News Poll indicated 57 percent of those surveyed said they believe at least half the members of the Senate and House are "corrupt."

There's no quick, easy way for Congress to prove that discouraging assessment wrong. But there's one important step which, if taken, could work wonders at changing things: curb the flow of special-interest money into the campaign coffers of our lawmakers.

During 1991, for the first time since Watergate, both the Senate and House passed serious campaign finance reform legislation that would limit overall campaign spending and reduce the role of special-interest contributions. A major challenge for Congress in 1992 is to meld these differing Senate and House bills into a single piece of strong legislation.

President Bush has threatened to veto any campaign reform bill that contains public financing. Yet, as Fred Wertheimer, president of Common Cause points out, "Bush has already run twice for the presidency under the very same kind of system and is about to do so for a third time."

It's time for Congress to clean up its campaign finance mess—and time, too, for President Bush to stop standing in the way.

[From the Wichita (KS) Eagle, Mar. 30, 1992]

NEXT: CONGRESS IS MOVING TO STOP PERKS, SO, NOW IT NEEDS TO GO FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Congress is moving toward getting rid of some perks. That's good. The recent flap about the House bank has pushed members to "just say no" to some of the most egregious privileges. But angry voters won't be mollified by higher charges for representatives to use the House gym and or higher prices for senators to eat in the Senate dinning room. The voters want more to assure them that there really is an attitude adjustment on Capitol Hill.

And the next step toward change—beyond that additional perk purging needs to take place—is for Congress to pass meaningful campaign finance reform legislation. The House and the Senate passed such legislation last session but no final action was taken before Congress recessed for the 1991 holidays. Now conferees are finally appointed and conference committee work to reconcile the two bills could begin as early as Tuesday.

There are two compelling reasons to change the way congressional campaigns are financed. The first is to make sure there's a level playing field for incumbents and opponents. That will never happen as long as political action committees pour millions of dollars each year into the campaign coffers of sitting members of Congress. Of the more than $108 million that PACs contributed to House candidates in 1990, for example, only 6 percent went to challengers. And the 31 senators seeking re-election in 1992 have more than $81 million in the campaign chests. The 46 candidates currently challenging the incumbent senators, in contrast, average $441,583 in campaign resources.

The second reason for passing true campaign reform legislation is the growing understanding that special interest contributions too often lead to special interest legislation. The health care industry—physicians, insurers, hospital and pharmaceutical administrators—have plowed millions of PAC dollars into undermining meaningful health care legislation. Heavy-hitter pesticide promoters have stalled environmentally sound

agricultural policy. Bankers have too much self-serving say in what limited banking reform legislation there is. The list goes on and on.

It's time for the next step in cleaning up Congress. Now that congressional leadership has moved on correcting the problem of bounced checks, it needs to move forward to correct the problem of PAC checks. Both actions would set the stage for further control over perks and privileges that have enraged voters and limited the institution's effectiveness.

[From the Cleveland (OH), Plain Dealer, Apr. 7, 1992]

CLEAN UP THE FILTHY CASH

Corruption strains the way America elects its lawmakers and makes its laws—corruption that rewards special interests and shortchanges the public interest. But this week, Congress seems ready to approve a campaign-finance reform package that would help break Washington's incumbent-protection racket.

As Congress crafted its worthy reform package, the White House last week raced to get ahead of the parade, yet offered only a half-hearted diversion from meaningful action. If President George Bush is serious about enacting realistic reforms, he must drop his threat to veto Congress' sensible cleanup plan.

The package, dubbed the most important anticorruption reform since the Watergate years by the Common Cause watchdog group, correctly targets the way special interests use campaign cash to manipulate lawmakers. The reform plan, while not perfect, includes the two essential elements of workable change. The first is reducing the amount of money spent by political action committees; the second is limiting overall spending for congressional races.

As Bush rightly notes, today's insidious PAC dominated system protect incumbents and discourages challengers. PACs subvert voters' demand for change by pouring money into the coffers of incumbents whose re-election seems threatened. With newcomers starved for cash, PAC donations keep incumbents beholden to special interests largesse and stifle ideas that might threaten the status quo.

PAC donations would be limited under the House and Senate plan. But Bush would merely wink at the problem, outlawing PACs run by business and labor (which tend to donate much of their money to Democrats) while putting no restrictions on single-issue ideological PACs (which funnel most of their money to Republicans).

To put challengers and incumbents on a fair footing, overall spending limits are essential. Congress' reform package would induce candidates to accept realistic spending limits. But the White House shuns spending caps, thus perpetuating weather candidates advantage.

Reinforcing the wisest post-Watergate reform—the public financing mechanism that has started to purge special pleaders' money from presidential elections—the reform package would offer congressional candidates incentives to accept spending limits. It would foster public participation by matching small-scale donations to House candidates; it would offer reduced-rate broadcasting time to Senate candidates and postage to House contestants. This package marks the first time both the House and Senate have moved simultaneously toward the ideal of public financing for all federal campaigns.

Best of all the reform plan would close the "sewer money" loophole that now allows $100,000 donors to purchase privileged access to presidential candidates. Such tainted donations undermine the post-Watergate structure.

Public outrage at lawmakers money-and-ethics scandals must propel the drive for comprehensive campaign-finance reform. If voters hope to win back control of their government from monied interests, they must insist that Bush join Congress in cleaning up Washington's filthy cash.

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 14, 1992]

REFORM CAMPAIGN FUNDING

Just look at what a little scandal will do: After years of Congress's self-serving procrastination, a House-Senate conference finally has gotten around to clearing campaign-finance legislation. It's the first of many badly needed reforms that can change the way Washington conducts its business.

This feat has been accomplished in the year of the check-overdraft scandal. Apparently the outcry from the scandal has pushed Capitol Hill toward passage of campaign finance reform.

The House has passed the revised bill, whose fate now rests with the Senate. The legislation does not provide for the profound changes that groups such as Common Cause rightly advocated. Still, it's as good as any reform that Congress is likely to pass. The last time it tried its hand at significant campaign finance reform, in 1974. Congress tried to diminish the influence of slush funds and "fat cats." Alas, it ended up replacing them with "fat PACs."

This bill changes the way that political action committees do business, thereby limiting their influence. It also encourages public financing of campaigns, provides for voluntary spending limits, and eliminates "soft money" from federal elections.

President Bush awaits, veto pen in hand, should the Senate pass this bill. This is the same president who has criticized Congress in the harshest terms and has called for deep changes in how legislators conduct their affairs.

Mr. Bush says that he opposes "public financing" of elections. But his opposition has not prevented him from accepting millions of dollars in public funds for his own presidential campaigns.

Congress should force his hand on campaign finance reform. If the President doesn't sign the bill, he is going to face more damaging accusations of passive-aggressive leadership in the fail.

As former Sen. Barry Goldwater, an elder statesman of the president's party, said some time ago: "PAC money . . . creates an impression that every candidate is bought and owned by the biggest givers." Without campaign finance reform, it will be hard to change that impression. The electorate, however, will know where to place the blame.

[From the Hartford (CT) Courant, Apr. 18, 1992]

A CLEANUP OF CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The campaign-spending measure passed by the U.S. House of Representatives doesn't go far enough, but it represents the most comprehensive reform in nearly 20 years. It would help to reduce the influence of special-interest money on elections. Now the Senate should pass it.

Unfortunately, President Bush's veto threat probably means there will be no political reform. Mr. Bush has yet to be overridden by Congress on any veto.

Reform-minded members of Congress—including Rep. Sam Gejdenson of Connecticut, who was the major force behind change on the House side—deserves credit nonetheless. Until now, Congress had refused to change a system that generously rewarded incumbents. Political action committees rarely pump a lot of money into the campaigns of challengers.

Here's what the bill would do:

Establish voluntary spending limits of $600,000 for House races per election cycle and a sliding scale for Senate races depending on the size of the state. House and Senate candidates would get public funds if they agreed to the voluntary spending limits. This would help challengers.

The public resources would be in the form of vouchers for free or discounted television time for Senate candidates, substantial postage discounts for candidates for both chambers, and matching payments for small contributions from individuals to House candidates.

Ban so-called soft money contributions that have been laundered through political parties in support of presidential campaigns.

Limit PAC contributions to no more than 20 percent of the Senate campaign spending limit and no more than one-third of the House limit. The total of large individual contributions to House candidates would be similarly limited. These aggregate limits would be a first. In addition, the amount that a Senate candidate could accept from an individual PAC would be cut in half, to $2,500.

The influence of special-interest money on government probably will never be eliminated, but it can be limited substantially. These proposals would help in cleaning up government.

Mr. Bush promises a veto because he does not like spending limits and the use of public funds in congressional elections. His aversion to public financing of elections is ironic, considering that, according to Common Cause, the president probably will have used a total of more than $200 million in public funds by the end of this year to run for president and vice president.

Mr. Bush has had a field day denouncing Congress as a broken institution in need of improvements. But on the question of campaign-financing reform, the president, not Congress, prefers the cozy status quo.

[From the Reno (NV) Gazette—Journal, Apr. 7, 1992]

CAMPAIGN FINANCE CHANGES ESSENTIAL

It has become traditional for campaign finance reform to become a key topic in an election year. Yet, year after year, very little seems to get done.

Perhaps this time, with voters in an anti-incumbent mood for a variety of legitimate reasons, comprehensive reform is possible. House and Senate conferees have crafted compromise legislation that merits approval. It would:

Impose reasonable campaign spending limits for congressional elections.

Ban huge "soft money" contributions.

Place restrictions on political action committee contributions.

The spending limits for those seeking a House seat would be $600,000. The Senate limit in an election year varies depending on the size of the state—$1.6 million to $8.3 million.

A "soft money" prohibition would end the practice of the wealthiest people in the country gaining special access and influence. Traditionally, these contributions have been as much as $100,000 per donor.

The legislation would also limit PAC contributions to no more than 20 percent of the total campaign spending limit for a Senate candidate. The House limit would be no more than one-third of the limit. Also, the amount a Senate candidate could accept from a PAC would be cut from $5,000 to $2,500.

President Bush has threatened a veto. This would be unfortunate. The measure does not constitute the sweeping changes that are perhaps needed, but they are an excellent start in restoring public confidence to a system in desperate need of being cleaned up.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, these editorials have been written because all across this country people realize the low esteem in which Congress is now held is in part traced back to a feeling that this institution no longer belongs to the people; that it is no longer serving the interests of the American people; that it is too much serving the interests of those narrow special-interest groups that are providing more and more and more of the money necessary to run political campaigns. The American people have come to wonder whether or not they really count for much of the political process anymore. They have become increasingly disillusioned as they have noted that in virtually 100 percent of the cases, actually 99 percent of the cases, those candidates with the most money in their war chests are those candidates that win elections. Therefore, the American people become disillusioned in the process. They sit back and they think about the pressures that a Member of Congress must be under, a Member of the Senate faced with raising almost $15,000 a week every week for 6 years to come up with the $4 million necessary to run for election, and they understand that, if a Member has a very short amount of time available and if there are several people waiting in the waiting room waiting to see him or see her, there will be a strong temptation to see that person who might be in the best position to make a campaign contribution as opposed to that person who would not be in such a position.

(Mr. WOFFORD assumed the chair.)

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, our constitutional system was not set up to enhance the influence of people who could make contributions or interest groups that could make contributions. It was not set up to have a system in which access was granted mainly to those who had the ability to make large campaign contributions. The system was set up to assure the American people at the grassroots across this country, in the rural areas, the small communities, the cities, urban areas, that this Government would belong to them and that they would know it was theirs, that we would fight out the issues on the basis of what is best for our country, and that we would elect people in the course of campaigns who put forward the best ideas.

Mr. President, we are at a turning point for this country. We have not yet prepared this country for the next century. When we look back at the last decade and we consider what has happened in this country, when we consider that the average jobs lost to the American people in the last decade averaged $440 a week, and we consider that the average jobs added in the last decade in this country averaged $280 a week, and we think about the future opportunities that our children and our grandchildren will have, when we think about what we are going to pass on to them it is clear we ought to be fighting elections based upon the vision for the future, a substantive, real debate about the issues and not based upon which candidate can raise the largest amount of money to put on the airways the largest number of 30-second negative campaign spots to try to win an election.

Mr. President, when you consider that the real incomes of the American people from 1950 to 1976 doubled, in a period of a little more than 25 years the real incomes of the American people doubled during that period of time in which the cold war was beginning, and you consider that at the rate of economic growth of the last decade as the cold war has been coming to a close, that our growth rate has been so low and in some years negative that it will take 4,600 years at the rate of economic growth in the last decade for the incomes, the real incomes, of Americans to double again, Mr. President, we cannot afford politics as usual.

We cannot afford a political system dominated by special interest money, where special interest groups give 25 times as much to incumbents who sit here as to challengers who are trying to get here with new and fresh ideas. We cannot afford a political system that imposes no limits on runaway campaign spending. We cannot afford at this moment in our Nation's history, when we must be grappling with fundamental decisions about its future course of action, we cannot afford a money chase taking our time and effort when we need to be devoting our time, our effort, our best intellectual focus and the courage, the moral courage, of our convictions to decide the future course of action for this country in a way that will hand on something to the next generation. We cannot afford a demeaning money chase which continues to dominate American politics. Public-interest groups that have been fighting for reform of the political process for years have hailed this bill as an important step toward limiting the money chase that has replaced the debate with the dollar.

Mr. President, the American people are watching. Indeed, as democracy continues to spread from Central America to Eastern Europe, with our system serving as a model for the rest of the world, it is no exaggeration to say that the entire world is watching. Not only is the strength of our own democracy at stake, but the legitimacy of our democratic system as an example to others in the world as a moral force in the world is also at stake.

We must not fail to meet our responsibilities as trustees of this great institution. we must act to restore the faith of our people in our democratic institutions. We must remove the stain of tainted money from the political process and, by doing so, tell Americans that one person-one vote can still make a difference; that an idea is still more important in the political process than a dollar; that an honest commitment to good government and the future of our country is more important than financial influence in our political system; that this institution, that this Senate, belongs not to those who are in a position to finance our reelection campaigns but that it belongs to all of the American people.

Mr. President, we will never be able to reassure the American people until we adopt a system that does something to stop runaway campaign spending, that puts the lid on it, that puts a limit on it, that finally brings it under control. There can be no real reform of our campaign system until we do something to stop the flow of money into the system in unlimited amounts.

Mr. President, I ask again how much is enough? How much is enough? If $600,000 was not enough for the average winning candidate to spend when I first came here some 14 years ago, is $4 million, which was the amount in the last election, enough or do we need to wait until it is $10, $20, or $50 million?

When we speak to the graduation classes of high school and college students this year, and we challenge them to go into the political process, step into the political arena themselves, to bring their best judgments and their talents, to give back to their country, and to commit themselves to the country as our generation was challenged by idealistic leaders in our time, will we also have the heart to tell them not only must they be thinking about how they want to make this country a better place? Not only must they be educating themselves so they will have the soundest concepts to assure our future, not only must they be willing to make the personal sacrifice in terms of their time for themselves, their time with their families, to devote more of themselves to their communities and the well-being of this Nation, they must also figure out how they are going to find the $4 million necessary to run for the U.S. Senate.

Or, if we are talking about their running 12 years from now or 15 or 20 years from now, how will they find the $10 or $20 or $50 million that will be necessary to run if the rate of increase in campaign spending continues as it has in the past? Will we have the heart to tell them that? Can we really tell them

that without believing it will have no impact on how they feel about their country? Can we really think that we can tell them that we want to leave and hand on to them a system in which there is no limit on the amount of money that will be required to run for public office in this country? There is no limit on the amount of money that special interest groups can pour into this political process.

Is that what we want to hand on to our children and our grandchildren? Is that what contributed to the greatness of this institution? Is that the kind of system that made this country the greatest democracy on the face of this Earth?

No, Mr. President. We have a higher responsibility than that. There are those that have said that the finest days of this institution are behind it, that an institution that was filled with giants that made it the greatest deliberative body in the world, that those are only times of history, that we have come into a period of time in which we have become too mediocre, too obsessed with our own individual interests, too committed to a system that favors incumbents—and of course this system does favor incumbents—too committed to a system that allows special interests to give $25 to every incumbent versus $1 for every challenger; a system in which money makes the difference and in which incumbents can raise money, $8 to $1?

Mr. President, is that what has become of this institution? Is that what has become of us? Are we no longer capable of being the trustees for the American people of this institution? Are we no longer capable of putting the interests of our country ahead of interests of ourselves?

Mr. President, this bill, this landmark legislation which imposes voluntary spending limits in keeping with Supreme Court decisions, which allows us to end the money chase in American politics, which reduces by more than half the ability of special interest groups to pour money into the American political system, gives us a unique opportunity to prove to ourselves and to prove to the American people that we have the moral courage and the vision and the long-range concern for the health of our political institutions necessary to meet the test?

Mr. President, the people have said to me how in the world are you so naive as to believe that this Congress which is so favored by the current system, that a group of people who have so much more ability to raise money than anyone else who is going to run against them, that a group of people who benefit so much more from special interest money than any candidates who run against them, would ever vote to change a system so tilted in their own direction? Why would a group of people, who are incumbents in Congress, who are so favored by this current system which distorts American politics, ever give up the advantage that they have?

Mr. President, let us hope that that group of people would give up that special benefit, that special advantage, because they might care about their country more than they care about their own political survival. Let us hope that there are enough members of this institution to realize that in the long run this institution is more important than any of us.

It has been said very often that what really gives satisfaction to any human being is to be a part of a process or a cause or an institution or an ideal bigger than oneself. We are all privileged to be a part of that. This Senate is bigger than any of us. Its health and its vitality is more important than the political career of any of us. Our country, our system, the legacy to be passed on to the next generation and America's role in the world is a cause far bigger than any of us.

Mr. President, like very few pieces of legislation that come before us, this piece of legislation tests who we are. This piece of legislation tests our reason for being here. It is not a matter of political party. It is not a matter of which side of the aisle we might find ourselves. It is a matter of our commitment to the future of this country and keeping its institutions strong.

So, Mr. President, we have come a long way over the last 10 years. We have come from a very small beginning with a handful of Members of this body supporting this effort now to passage of a bill through both Houses of Congress that will begin to address this problem.

A perfect bill? Absolutely not. Can flaws be found in it? Certainly. Flaws can be found in any piece of legislation, particularly any compromise that has to be worked out between two parties in two different branches of government and two different bodies within the Congress itself. But an important step in the right direction? Yes. An important step toward restoring the political process that has been so badly damaged and eroded over the past two decades? Yes. A step worth taking? Most certainly.

So, Mr. President, let us meet the challenge. Let us show that we are prepared to make sacrifices in order to further our country, to revitalize the political process, and to make it a process open to our best and brightest and our most committed especially those in the next generation, who will sit here 10, 20, 30 years from now in the seats that do not belong to us, the seats that we simply temporarily occupy as trustees for them, having benefited so much from the courage and vision of those that have come before us. Let us meet the test by passing with an overwhelming bipartisan majority the conference report on S. 3.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, many important issues come before the Senate each year. We debate legislation that affects millions of Americans in their daily lives. One issue broadly important to all that we do is how we finance election campaigns for Federal office. The way we finance Federal election campaigns legitimizes our governmental responsibilities. The financing of election campaigns can determine who is elected to office, how legislation is considered, and the degree to which the public supports our decisions.

The conference report before the Senate today represents a truly historic opportunity to enact legislation that will fundamentally reform the way Federal elections are financed. It is a bill that directly attacks the most serious problem in the election process: the dominant role of money in Federal election campaigns.

For 10 years, I have advocated legislation to reform our campaign finance system. I have introduced legislation in every Congress since my first election to the Senate in 1982. Many other Members of this body have worked for years in support of campaign finance reform legislation. No one has done more than the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]. He has been, indisputably, the national leader in the effort to reform the process by which Federal election campaigns are financed and conducted.

Senator BYRD, Senator FORD, and others, have also been leaders. But I believe they would agree with me in acknowledging that we have gotten this far because of Senator BOREN's efforts. I thank him for those efforts.

Mr. President, we have all been motivated by a concern for the effect the current system has on the operation of Congress, and on public attitudes toward this institution and the Federal Government. Unfortunately, our greatest fears have been realized. There has been a significant change in the way the public views this institution and the way in which we run for election.

The American public holds Congress in low esteem. They also believe their President does not care about their concerns. What has historically been a healthy dose of skepticism among the American people toward their Government has, unfortunately, given way to an alarming degree of cynicism about the ability of Government to deal with our Nation's problems.

There is far greater public scrutiny of the campaign finance process today. Most Senators are demeaned by the extent to which we must search for money to fund our campaigns. The process is even more distasteful to the American people.

They see a campaign finance process that with each election cycle is becom-

ing even more reliant on money—in congresional elections, and in Presidential elections. Increasingly, the American people have come to see their Government as no longer responsive to their needs. They believe their Government acts to fulfill commitments to campaign contributors, rather than to serve the interests of the people. They believe we have created a campaign finance system that is stacked against challengers and designed especially to keep incumbents in office forever.

In large part, this is due to the overwhelming role of money in the American election process, and none of this is surprising, even the huge cost of running for office today; the thousands of political action committees that have organized to fund campaigns; the scores of wealthy individuals and corporations that line up to make contributions of $100,000 and more to the President of the United States.

In recent years, money has come to dominate the Federal election campaign process. This has provided protection to incumbents. It has dissuaded many able persons from seeking election. It has favored wealthy office seekers who can finance their own campaigns, and at the same time, it has increased the influence of wealthy special interest contributors and severely undermined public confidence in our Government.

Any person who cares about this great Nation, who cares about our system of government, must deplore this situation. It is clear that we must change our campaign finance laws.

This conference report offers that opportunity. It will make dramatic changes in the way Federal election campaigns are financed. The conference report will substantially reduce the role of money in the election process and help restore public confidence in our political process by making elections more competitive. This legislation includes the fundamental reform necessary to clean up the current system and restore public trust in our election process: limits on campaign spending. That is the essence of reform. Limits on spending.

The bill also limits the role of political action committees, cleans up the soft money mess, prohibits bundling of campaign contributions, encourages less negative campaign advertisements, and gives challengers the resources to mount effective campaigns.

The only meaningful way to reform the Senate election finance system is to limit campaign spending. Anything less avoids the real issue and simply creates the illusion of reform.

Since 1976, congressional election spending has increased almost fourfold, requiring that Members of Congress devote a far greater amount of time to fundraising activities. This trend toward ever-higher costs has favored incumbents over challengers. In the most recent Senate elections in 1990, incumbents spent $138 million, almost three times as much as the $51 million spent by challengers. Winning Senate incumbents spent, on average, almost $4 million for their reelection campaigns. That requires raising $13,000 a week, 52 weeks a year, for each of the 6 years of a Senate term.

Spending will continue to escalate still higher until reasonable limits are placed on campaign spending. No matter what other changes are adopted, without spending limits, we will not have addressed the real problem. This conference report establishes on alternative campaign finance system for candidates who agree, voluntarily, to limit their spending for House and Senate campaigns. Senate candidates will be encouraged to agree to such limits by having available to them broadcast vouchers, lower broadcast rates, and discounted mail. House candidates will be encouraged to agree to such limits by having available to them matching funds and discounted mail.

In addition, contingent public financing will be available to Senate candidates who agree to a spending limit if their opponent exceeds the limit.

The participation of PAC's in Federal election campaigns will be curtailed. House candidates will be limited to raising $200,000 an election cycle from political action committees. Senate candidates will not be permitted to raise more than 20 percent of their election limit from PAC's, and the maximum PAC contribution to a candidate will be cut in half. If these rules had been in effect for the 1990 election, PAC contributions to Senate incumbents would have been reduced by 53 percent.

The conference report includes tough new rules prohibiting the use of soft money to affect Federal elections and severely limiting the practice of bundling. In recent years, our campaign finance laws have been undermined by the practice of raising large sums of money from individuals, corporations and labor unions not otherwise permitted under Federal law. A large portion of these funds have been used by party committees to fund activities that support Federal elections.

The use of soft money has been a particular problem in Presidential races. In the last Presidential election both candidates raised tens of millions of dollars in campaign contributions not permitted under Federal law. Although they participated in the publicly financed Presidential campaign system and agreed not to raise private contributions for their general election campaigns, their agents were in fact out raising enormous sums of money.

There has been a return to the pre-Watergate, Presidential campaign finance era. Wealthy individuals and corporations contribute enormous sums of money to fund Presidential candidates. In 1988 alone, 249 individuals and corporations contributed at least $100,000 each to the campaign of George Bush. Some of those contributors were awarded with ambassadorships. Some were beneficiaries of legislative initiatives proposed by the President. Most of them have been given special access to Cabinet members and other important Government officials. All of the $100,000 contributors were invited to the White House to receive a thank you from their President.

These practices continue today. The Bush campaign has been embarrassed by recent reports on fundraising techniques that involve avoidance of the contribution limits of the law through the practice of raising soft money and bundled contributions. Corporations were listed as sponsors of a fundraising event in Michigan even though corporations have been prohibited from giving to Federal election campaigns since 1907. The Bush campaign pointed out that the listed corporations did not make direct contributions but instead contributions were bundled on behalf of the executives of the corporation.

But whether the corporations were contributing soft money directly or making bundled contributions indirectly through their employees, there is no question they have been involved in an effort to legally avoid the requirements of Federal election laws. And it must be said openly and candidly that Democrats also use these tactics to raise campaign funds. This is not a problem that is limited to one party. It involves both parties. It infects the entire system.

The legislation we are debating today closes down these loopholes. Under this conference report, political party committees would be prohibited from using soft money on activities that affect a Federal election. Federal candidates and office holders would be prohibited from raising soft money. Bundling of contributions in order to avoid the contribution limits of the law would be prohibited as well.

This is tough legislation that would dramatically change the way Federal elections are financed. It is good legislation that directly responds to the public's anger about Federal election campaigns.

And most importantly, it is balanced legislation that treats Republicans and Democrats alike and, fairly, while leveling the playing field to give challengers a better opportunity to mount effective campaigns.

This legislation is not perfect. Like all legislation, it is the product of compromise. If there were my bill alone, I would have done some things differently. But it is a major achievement that we have gotten this far with a bill that changes so much.

We will hear from those who oppose real reform of our campaign finance

laws. They will advance all kinds of arguments against this legislation. That it is too costly. That it protects incumbents. That it does not go far enough.

Let us face reality. No matter what legislation is proposed to reform the Federal election finance laws, opponents of reform will attack it. In truth, they oppose changing the current campaign finance system with it heavy reliance on money.

The position of President Bush is the most transparently inconsistent. He has run in four Presidential elections under a system of voluntary spending limits and public funding. By the end of this year President Bush will have received $200 million in public funds to run for Federal office; more than any person in the history of this country. Yet President Bush says that he opposes this legislation because it includes voluntary spending limits and partial public financing of elections. In all of American politics there is not a more clear example of saying one thing and doing another.

We in public life must take stands on many issues and we are often accused of being inconsistent. But the President's position on this issue goes well beyond that. President Bush says he opposes this bill because it includes spending limits and public benefits. At the same time, he is running for election and voluntarily participating in a system which involves spending limits and public benefits. In fact, in the same week in early April, this month, in the same week, the President asked the Federal Election Commission for $2 million of public funds and then turned around and promised a veto of this bill because it includes some public funds.

The President cannot have it both ways. He cannot voluntarily accept public benefits and spending limits while vetoing this legislation because it provides what he has been accepting. And I emphasize his acceptance is voluntary. The President does not have to participate in a system of spending limits and public benefits. He has chosen to do so voluntarily and as a consequence of which before this year is out he will have received $200 million in taxpayers' funds for his campaigns, more than any person in history.

Mr. President, what are the opponents of this legislation afraid of? That we might clean up the system; that we might distance wealthy interests from the political process? This legislation would create an alternative campaign finance system that is voluntary. If they do not like it, they do not have to participate in it. But do not penalize the system and our representative democratic government by standing in the way of reform.

Probably the most common complaint from opponents of campaign finance reform is that spending limits inherently benefit incumbents. But that argument is wrong. It is contradicted by the facts. This conference report represents an unprecedented proposal from incumbent Members of Congress to make it easier for challengers to mount effective campaigns.

This is accomplished in several ways. First, the spending limits in this bill help challengers by largely serving as a restraint on spending by incumbents. Second, the reduced broadcast costs in this bill facilitate the ability of challengers to advertise their message to the voters. Third, the broadcast vouchers enable challengers to purchase advertising time. Fourth, the limitations on PAC contributions limit a fundraising source that is far more accessible to incumbents than to challengers.

One need only look at the most recent elections to see the overwhelming advantage that incumbents have over challengers under the current system. In the 28 races where an incumbent faced a challenger in the 1990 elections, challengers were outspent in all but two races.

In the 28 races, the incumbent outspent the challenger 26 times out of 28. And the total margin was almost 3 to 1.

Since 1986 there have been 83 Senate elections between an incumbent and a challenger. Incumbents have outspent their challengers in 93 percent of those elections, winning 85 percent of them. For the most part, this legislation limits the spending of Senate incumbents, not Senate challengers, because in almost all races it is only incumbents who spend more than the limits in the bill.

Obviously, limits could benefit incumbents, if they were set so low as to prevent challengers from communicating to the public. But this legislation does just the opposite. It provides generous spending limits which are in reality higher than they appear because the cost of airing broadcast ads will be cut by more than 50 percent in the same legislation.

Another argument opponents of reform will make is that this legislation does not go far enough because it does not eliminate political action committees. But that is a phony argument because it is quite clear that cannot legally be done.

The bill as it passed the Senate did propose the elimination of political action committees. But there was a great deal of discussion at that time as to the constitutionality of that provision, and the legislation therefore included a backup provision anticipating the possibility that an outright ban would be unconstitutional. This backup provision was proposed by both Republicans and Democrats.

Since then we have received a good deal more advice that the Constitution will not permit a ban on PAC's. In the Buckley decision the Supreme Court clearly said the right to associate is a basic constitutional freedom that cannot be denied through legislation. The constitutional scholars who advised us recommended instead that we impose stringent overall limits on PAC contributions, which we have done.

Although I expect we will hear speeches suggesting the opposite, it should be clear that the President has never advocated eliminating PAC's. Instead he has only proposed the elimination of some PAC's; those connected to a labor union, corporation or trade association.

But, under the President's proposals, unconnected political action committees would continue to thrive. The problem with this approach is that it does nothing to effectively limit the role of PAC's in election campaigns. Instead, those existing PAC's banned under the President's proposal would simply disband and reorganize as ideological PAC's. In fact, the current situation is likely to be made much worse as PACs representing a common economic interest proliferate as so-called ideological PAC's.

The only effective way to limit the role of PACs is to impose an aggregate limitation on the amount that any one candidate may receive from political action committees. This legislation does that. It is tough legislation that will cut in half the overall amount of PAC contributions to Senate incumbent candidates.

We have heard it often said that Congress lacks the ability and the will to pass tough legislation that is for the good of the Nation; that Congress cannot pass legislation because it bends to the will of special interests; that we cannot act because Members of Congress are too worried about reelection to support needed legislation that may be politically unpopular for some.

This is the perfect opportunity to disprove those allegations. If you want to take on special interests, vote for this conference report. If you want to stand up for something that you know is the right thing to do, vote for this conference report. If you believe in our democratic system of government and are genuinely disturbed by public attitudes about our Federal Government, vote for this conference report.

The American people have lost confidence in the Federal election campaign process. They question the very integrity of this institution and of its Members. Every Senator, without regard to party, deplores this situation. Almost every Senator agrees that our campaign finance laws must be rewritten.

We must not let those who are opposed to real and genuine reform stand in the way of this important legislation. Now is the time to enact campaign finance reform legislation to restore the integrity of this institution and its Members.

This is good legislation that must be enacted into law. I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Republican leader is on the way to the floor to speak on this legislation. Let me just say, in anticipation of his arrival, that criticizing the President of the United States for opposing this legislation is about like saying because the House has a bank, the Senate ought to have a bank.

Nothing—I repeat, nothing—could possibly symbolize the American public's disillusion with Congress more than this bill. This really sums it up. It does nothing about PAC's. It does nothing about sewer money. It reduces the influence of parties, the one entity out there, Mr. President, in the American political system, that will support challengers—that we all profess to have interest in—who are nailed by this.

And of course, the final outrage, it calls upon the taxpayers to pay for it at a time when we have an enormous deficit, a growing deficit. Our response: Create another entitlement program for us. I have called it food stamps for politicians, Mr. President. I think that pretty well sums it up.

The other thing, it is pretty safe to say, Mr. President, as has been said by my good friend on the other side of the aisle, Senator BOREN, with whom I have debated this issue now for some 5 years, I think the one thing we can say we probably agree on, on this issue, is we are sorry nothing is going to happen. It is too bad. But nothing symbolizes or sums up the differences between the two parties more than this legislation.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle look out at the American public and they see what they perceive to be all these corrupting influences out there who want to participate in our campaigns; these organizations of American citizens who want to participate by contributing, in most instances, a relatively small and fully disclosed contribution to our campaign.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle find that corrupting, but yet find it somehow cleansing to reach into the treasury and pull out tax dollars to fund our campaigns. To insulate us from what? To insulate us from all these American citizens who would lie to become involved in our campaigns? Mr. President, I do not find that offensive. I think they ought to have a right to participate in the way that people do participate these days. In a country of 250 million people in the television age, the way people participate in campaigns today is to make contributions.

I will have the specific statistics later, but Republicans this year have collected a substantial amount of money from a whole lot of donors, averaging about $45 apiece. We do not find that corrupting. We find it appropriate for all of these people out there to participate in the political process.

Mr. President, I will have more to say about that later. I see that the Republican leader is here and would like to speak to this measure, and I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader, the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kentucky. I want to commend him for his work, and for diligence and knowledge with reference to this subject matter, as well as my friend from Oklahoma.

I think we have a difference of opinion on this particular conference report, but I am still convinced there are enough of us here who really want to have campaign finance reform because sooner or later it is going to happen and the sooner the better.

We are returning to Congress today after the so-called Easter recess to an institution which has never been held in lower esteem by the American people. Yesterday's Gallup poll confirmed that lowest esteem showing 80 percent of Americans polled think the Government is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves. No doubt about it, the House check-bouncing scandal seems to be the straw that broke the camel's back, but the seeds of discontent had been planted long ago, planted right here by Congress. Just as the American people suspect, Congress has been more interested in protecting the status quo and guaranteeing incumbency rather than opening up itself to more and more political competition.

So that brings us to the debate today which I think is an issue as much as any other issue that I can think of that is going to determine what happens around here and who is really for the status quo and incumbency and who might be for competition and change. I think we ought to make one point clear: No one person, no one party has a monopoly on campaign reform, and no one person and no one party has all the answers either.

The Democrats have a bill on the floor, developed in a conference committee without any real Republican participation, which will place limits on spending and use tax dollars to fund congressional campaigns. The President—not only the President, I would guess the great majority of the American people, if they think about it—know that both these things are bad ideas. I read a letter today from the ACLU—I do not often read letters from the ACLU—where they are complaining about spending limits, about caps on spending.

So I think there are a lot of people who are not particularly interested in the Republican Party who believe this is the wrong approach. We want to broaden participation, not limit participation. We want more competition, not less. And one way to protect incumbents is to put a limit on what you can spend, and then some challengers will have very little opportunity.

So the President believes, and I share the view, that limits will only hurt challengers and ensure the election of more incumbents. As I have said, the ACLU, the American Civil Liberties Union, is not exactly a Republican think tank, and they came out against the bill for precisely the same reason. They question its constitutionality and argue that limits "impinge directly on freedom of speech and association and will not solve the problem of fairness and financial equity that the legislation is intended to remedy."

Furthermore, if anything is clear to all of us, if we have been home, if we have talked to people, if we read our mail, it is that the American people are frustrated. They are frustrated with the Republicans, they are frustrated with Democrats, they are frustrated with Independents. Some are so frustrated they are going to get active in politics, which I think is one good thing, because for too long about half the people have been on the sidelines thinking they cannot make a difference. We have the Ross Perot factor and all the other factors. Nobody is certain how it will play at the Presidential level or congressional races. If Ross Perot will be a plus or minus for Democrats, Republicans, running for the Congress, for the Senate, we do not know. But I do not believe this is a very good time to advocate another program that helps Members of Congress get reelected—public funding. I get very few letters these days saying we ought to do more for Members of Congress. In fact, I have not received any saying we ought to do more for Members of Congress. Most people think we ought to do less.

I want to commend the Senator from Oklahoma, who is going to join with the Senator from New Mexico in trying to change this system so we can stop some of the spiraling spending in Congress for staff and other things. So it just seems to me that whether we are Republicans or Democrats, this is not the year to go out and suggest to people who are out of work, whose business may be bad, who may be Republicans, Democrats, Independents, who do not even care, and say, "Boy, have we got a plan for you, have we got a plan for you. We have a plan, we are going to get Federal money to run our campaigns—your money." I do not think that is really what the American people believe will bring about more competition.

Why not make the party stronger? Why not let the parties do this? This is an idea we have on our side and maybe eventually it will end up in a bill we pass and is signed by the President. We

want to make the party stronger, not the political action committees stronger, not the special interests, but the parties stronger. When we make the parties stronger, more people will be attracted to the Democratic Party and the Republican Party and it will be better for all of us.

But the thing that we really sort of choke on with this conference report is we have two bills. We have one for House Members and one for Senators which indicates—and I was not at the conference and I do not want to denigrate anyone who was—it indicates they took everything the House wanted and everything the Senate wanted and said, "This is our bill." So the House looks after its interest. They have a different rule on PAC's than the Senate bill and different limits and all those things.

It just seems to me there is no reason why this bill should become law. It is not going to become law. I have said to the majority leader, I have said it publicly, I have said it privately, and we have made bona fide efforts, I think some on each side, including the two who are on the floor now managing this conference report, to have meaningful campaign reform. The problem is that in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives, we are dealing with something that affects us directly and it is pretty hard to get a meeting of the minds. So we end up too often looking out for our own interests.

I want to suggest that I think we have a blueprint for reform on the Republican side. We think that the objective ought to be making elections more competitive, not making incumbents safer. That means helping challengers, reducing the interests of the so-called special interests and slowing down the fundraising money chase and strengthening the role of political parties. I do not see anything wrong with that. We need stronger parties. We need more people participating in politics. We need to give the people a reason to participate in politics because there are a lot of views out there that are fairly cynical about politics and politicians, and we need to change those where we can.

We can take a big bite out of the biggest cost of campaigning by requiring discounted and free television time. I do not know what the percentage is. I know the managers know, what is it, 60, 70 percent of the money we raise in a campaign goes to the media, radio or television? So when people give you $100, $70 is going to go back to TV advertising. People say you spend too much money in your campaign. Again there some TV people who do not like that provision, but I do think there is a certain amount of public service that ought to be directed toward providing competition in politics.

We can cut the individual limit for out-of-State donors. In other words, I am from Kansas; we cut the limit that somebody in Indiana, Michigan, or New York, or California can give to a Kansas candidate and you can cap the amount of out-of-State contributions. But I do not think I want to stand up in my State and say, "You cannot contribute to my campaign, I have already reached the limit," if there are spending limits. "You cannot contribute $1, $10, $100, or $500 to my campaign."

I am not certain it is constitutional anyway. And we have to face the facts. We are political parties. People say, "Oh, there is too much politics." The bottom line is we are political parties. And we are in the business of defeating incumbents and electing our own candidates. Democrats do that; Republicans do that. That is the way the system works. That is the way it probably should work. That is why we need to boost the parties' ability to financially support cash-strapped challengers by increasing what political parties can give to their candidates.

If we are really serious about improving competition in politics, we ought to be strengthening, not continually weakening, the one institution that has a vested interest in removing incumbents, the Democrat and the Republican parties.

We are having a little event tonight here in town, nothing spectacular, medium sized. And the thrust of that little party tonight is to raise money to defeat Democrats. We are proud of that. We like Democrats. We like them when there are not as many as there are right now in the Senate, like them better. And then they are going to have a dinner and do the same thing. They like Republicans. They like it a lot better when there are fewer of us. That is the way the system works. That is called politics.

(Mr. DIXON assumed the chair.)

Mr. DOLE. Some people do not like politics. I do not fault people who do not like politics, but I do not know of any other system that works better anywhere in the world than the American system.

One thing that I think—I think it may have been Senator MCCONNELL's idea, the Senator from Kentucky who knows more about campaign financing than anyone on this side on the aisle and I think as much as anyone in this body—one innovative way we can level the playing field is by creating a seed money fund allowing party committees to match early in-State contributions to challengers, give contributions to challengers to give these candidates the jump start they need to wage a credible campaign.

I do not care where you are from; if you are from my State or the State of Oklahoma or the State of Kentucky, the State of Illinois, wherever, you have an incumbent and you have a good challenger and you look at how much each has raised, it is going to be almost the same across the country. The challenger might be a better candidate, maybe raised $30,000 in a close race, where the incumbent has $180,000, $200,000, $300,000 already in the bank. So we need to figure out some way to give these challengers in the Democratic Party and the Republican Party some kind of seed money to give them a jump start so they can get a credible campaign going.

None of these ideas are brand new. They were debated in the Senate last year. But the political atmosphere in America is new. That is the new thing. These ideas are not new but the political atmosphere is new. The American people are going to demand more of us whether we are Democrats or Republicans, and these are common sense reforms that I believe the American people would embrace if they were fully understood.

That is not going to happen in this debate. We are voting on a conference report. Unfortunately, the bill will pass, probably on party lines. I do not think there is going to be an effort to block a vote. I have not had a discussion with the Senator from Kentucky on that. But there will not be enough votes to override a veto, which means that there is not going to be any campaign finance reform, or probably not going to be any this year. So then we are going to come back again next year. We will get into another election cycle and it will not be effective until 1996, 1998, 2000—2000 might be the goal—but in the meantime we maintain the status quo.

It is no wonder why many might agree with the editorial in yesterday's Roll Call:

> Our own rather cynical take on the campaign finance story is that reform keeps dying because most incumbents want it to die. Both sides have valid points to make but what makes us cynical is that there has been no serious effort to reach a compromise.

Mr. President, I would take exception to one line of that statement. Back in 1990 there was a serious effort to reach a bipartisan compromise, and there are going to be serious efforts after this to reach a compromise. Senate Majority Leader MITCHELL and I appointed a six-member bipartisan panel of campaign finance experts, and we asked them to come up with suggestions on ways to fix the system. And in their report the panel suggested a flexible approach to limiting campaign spending whereby so-called bad money such as PAC contributions and large out-of-State contributions would be severely limited while good money—you have bad money and good money. Bad money to some is out-of-State contributions coming to somebody in Kansas. Bad money is political action committees coming to anybody, any candidate for the Senate or the House—while good money, good money is money you raise in your State from your constituents,

from Democrats, Republicans and independents in your State. That is good money. And small out-of-State donations. We put a limit on how much you could raise out of State. You would not limit small out-of-State donations, but you would have a cap.

So Republicans have incorporated many of the bipartisan panel recommendations in our own reform proposal. But again I think it is painful to some that the meaningful reforms proposed by this bipartisan group—I am not even certain of the politics of the six members. I am not certain there were more Democrats or Republicans or what. There may have been more independents. But their proposals, along with other proposals, advanced by Democrats and Republicans, are not covered in the conference report before us.

So I want to suggest that what we are debating today is not going to fix the system. It is not going to pass. And I know that this being an election year, there is an effort to pass it so the President has to take a look at it and veto it.

But it may not be too late. I said several months ago on the Senate floor we are not going to have campaign finance reform until the leaders in the House and the Senate are part of the group that negotiates any conference or anything else. Until the leaders are involved, you are not going to have campaign finance reform. And so maybe it is not too late.

Maybe the first thing we ought to do is regain the people's confidence and trust and that is not too late. Probably the best thing that could happen would be if we just took this bill off the floor, say we know this bill is not going anywhere, it is an effort to embarrass President Bush and put the Republicans on the spot, or give the Democrats a vote and keep them in the majority. They have that right. But just pull this bill off the floor and maybe call together these experts again and others the House leaders might want to bring in, and see if we could not do something on campaign financing that would be real reform.

I do not think it would take all that much time. There are some in this body who are never going to be satisfied. They are not going to vote for any campaign finance reform, I do not care how good it might be. There are some who are just not going to do it. They like the present system, or they think in an effort to fix it we might make it worse. So there are some on both sides of the aisle who would not be satisfied with a true compromise.

So let us give the American people the reform they are demanding. And I think though a lot of people do not directly participate, the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, tonight, for example, we have 14,000 donors participating in this event we are having—14,000. I read about a couple in some of the newspapers, I cannot remember which ones, but there are thousands of others who are participating. I have read the editorials in the New York Times and the Washington Post and the others who grasp every liberal idea as if they invented it and say, boy, this is a great idea; I wish we would have thought of it. We are for it because the Democrats are for it. That is not reform either. So I believe if you ask most American voters in both parties or either party or the independents who are rushing to Ross Perot's banner, they will indicate they do not want public financing. Particularly this year they do not think we deserve it. And I must say as a Republican I have looked at it from time to time. Say maybe the public financing is what we need. We are the minority party. Maybe we ought to have it for 4 years and sunset it. If it works, and we take over the place, then we can terminate it after 4 years.

I am not sure that will pass, but it is an idea. But that probably will not happen either. But there are a lot of good young men and women across America looking at the congressional races and willing to dedicate their time and their effort, and it will take a lot of effort because in nearly every case they are not going to have any money, or enough to make a credible challenge.

So I hope after we go through this effort after the bill is passed—and I assume there will be a vote on it, maybe sometime tomorrow or Thursday. It will be vetoed, and the veto will be sustained. But it is still not too late. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas yields the floor. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Republican leader for his interest in this issue from the beginning and his keen insight into this whole problem. He has been around here for a while and gets a prudent understanding of the direction we ought to take.

Mr. President, nobody is more frustrated with this issue than myself, with the possible exception of my friend from Oklahoma. There is not anybody in here advocating the status quo.

There is a way, as the Republican leader pointed out, to get bipartisan campaign finance reform. We had a group of eight, four on each side, appointed when Senator BYRD was majority leader. We knew then, and we knew in each of the subsequent years, the areas we could agree on but unfortunately—and this is the kind of thing that drives the American people right up against the wall—rather than reach out for a common ground among which we could agree, for example, doing something about the cost of health benefits, strengthening the parties, reducing the influence of special interests. Instead the temptation—and I do not blame the majority. It is an enormous temptation when you have the votes to try to draft the rules in a way that benefits you. Of course, when that happens, it is to be anticipated that the minority will not go along with it. It is axiomatic that he who writes the rule can control the game. With all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, the majority has crafted here both for the House and for the Senate the perfect set of rules to perpetuate the majority in power.

So let us get away for a moment if we can from the issue of what the Democrats think about this bill and what the Republicans think about this bill. The Republican leader mentioned the American Civil Liberties Union, not exactly a subsidiary of the Republican Party activities. The ACLU makes the point about the Constitution.

Mr. President, let me say this bill will not last for a minute in the courts; not a minute. There is nothing voluntary about this spending limit. If you are so brash as to accept the notion put forward in Buckley versus Valeo, about spending and speech, you cannot, consistent with the first amendment, dole out speech in equal quantities.

If you are so brash as to say I want to speak as much as I can, you get punished. Bad things happen to you. You lose your broadcast discount. The taxpayers subsidize your opponent when you go above the limit and choose to speak too much.

The bill does not stop there. If the group wants to engage in independent expenditures protected under Buckley versus Valeo, something neither side here likes by the way, neither Republicans nor Democrats particularly like independent expenditure, particularly because we are always afraid that somebody who is trying to help us is going to hurt us, and somebody who is trying to hurt us is really going to hurt us, we are all nervous about independent expenditures. Completely aside from how we may feel about it, the Supreme Court has said that you cannot constitutionally restrict it.

What this bill before us purports to do is to counter independent expenditures out of the Treasury. Let me give you a hypothetical. Let us say that B'nai B'rith was offended by David Duke. I think that is a reasonable assumption. B'nai B'rith headquartered outside of Louisiana decided to make independent expenditures within Louisiana to counter offensive speech by David Duke. What would happen under this bill? David Duke would get taxpayers' money to respond to B'nai B'rith under this bill.

This is not campaign finance reform, Mr. President. This is craziness. This

does not make any sense. First we are going to trash the first amendment. Second, we are going to have taxpayers involuntarily opposing excess speech. We are going to reward crackpot candidates like we have under the Presidential system of Lyndon LaRouche who have gotten millions from the taxpayers. Are we going to doll this up and call it reform?

Mr. President, you cannot applaud this bill. Reasonable people do not applaud this bill. The ACLU does not applaud this bill.

David Broder, probably the most respected political reporter in America, wrote about this bill last summer. This bill has not changed much from last summer. "Bogus Campaign Finance Reform." What did David Broder say? He said this bill nails the parties, the one entity out there in the political landscape that will support challengers, and it nails the parties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the ACLU letter dated April 27, 1992, and the David Broder piece that I just referred to appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACLU WASHINGTON OFFICE,
April 27, 1992.

DEAR SENATOR: The American Civil Liberties Union opposes the campaign financing legislation that will be considered this week by the Senate. The limitations on campaign contributions and expenditures contained in the conference bill impinge directly on freedom of speech and association and will not solve the problems of fairness and financial equity that the legislation is intended to remedy. Moreover, in our view, the legislation's imposition of contribution and expenditure caps in return for partial public financing amount to an unconstitutional condition on freedom of speech. In essence, it amounts to government buying an agreement from candidates that they will not speak as freely and frequently as they otherwise might and that they will impose additional limits on the expressions of support they will accept from others.

It is true that the current system of private campaign financing does cause disparities in the ability of different groups, individuals, and candidates to communicate their views on politics and government. However, the appropriate response in keeping with our nation's constitutional commitment to civil liberties is to expand, rather than limit, the resources available for political advocacy. Public financing can play a powerful role in expanding political participation and understanding, but it should not be used as a device to give the government a restrictive power over political speech and association.

We urge you to reject the campaign finance package that emerged from the conference and instead focus on meaningful reforms that would facilitate the candidacies of those who might not otherwise run and broaden the spectrum of campaign debate.

Sincerely,

MORTON H. HALPERIN.
ROBERT S. PECK,
Legislative Counsel.

[From the Washington Post, June 2, 1991]

BOGUS CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(By David S. Broder)

In 1990, the Ford Motor Co. sold more than 3.5 million vehicles in the United States and spent $735 million on advertising—an average of about $208 per customer. General Motors and Chrysler appear to have spent at least as much—maybe more.

I tell you this not to make some point about auto advertising but to provide the context for the debate about political campaign financing. When I asked Washington Post researcher Mark Stencel to run these numbers, I had just finished reading the five days of debate that preceded last week's Senate passage of a campaign finance bill. That bill was designed to curb what one Democrat after another called "the money chase" that now supposedly makes a misery of senators' lives.

Sen. David Boren (D-Okla.) repeatedly warned that "the amount of money [needed] to run successfully for the House and the Senate has been escalating at an alarming rate. . . . Spending per voter [in Senate races] last year continued to climb, going up from the rate of $1.41 per voter spent in 1988 to $1.87 per voter in 1990."

Even at that higher figure, it is less than 1/100th of what any of the Big Three auto companies spends on persuasion for each sale. The comparison is not irrelevant. One reason the cost of campaigns is rising is that candidates are competing, not just with each other, but with all the other products and services being marketed to the American public. Why should a society that tolerates an avalanche of auto, soft drink, beer and cold remedy advertising choke on a relatively small amount of political persuasion?

The answer, we are told, is that senators are forced to engage in a nonstop pursuit of contributions, diverting them from their real work as legislators. Well, as Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) pointed out, more than $80 of every $100 senators raise is collected in the final two years of their six-year terms. They could, with minimal risk, give themselves a complete vacation from fund-raising for two-thirds of their terms. If they don't, it's because they don't want to, not because they have to.

I dwell on these points to illustrate what is so maddening about the way Congress deals with campaign finance reform. The bill the Senate passed and the one the House is likely to pass in the next couple months are based on public perceptions the members of Congress know to be false. They are tailored to satisfy an agenda set largely by editorial writers and by Common Cause. The members of Congress use the camouflage provided by these well-meaning reformers to skirt the most serious problem in the way campaign funds are raised and distributed.

The Senate bill caps campaign spending and (in a move of very doubtful constitutionality) abolishes political-action committees (PACs), the convenient symbol of special-interest influence. It was passed amid knowing winks, after being loaded with other feel-good "reforms," like a purported ban on virtually all outside income. Senators were read a letter from President Bush saying he would certainly veto it because of his objection to spending limits and public financing.

Bush can match anyone when it comes to phony arguments on this issue. Although he has happily accepted taxpayer financing in his past presidential campaigns, he argues that it would be indecent for congressional races to enjoy a similar subsidy.

There is a widespread view on Capitol Hill that the provisions of the House and Senate bills don't matter, because the real measure—if there is to be one—will be written in a House-Senate conference, with the bipartisan leaders of both bodies negotiating with each other and with the president.

One has to hope so. The bills taking shape deal unsatisfactorily with the crucial problem. That problem is the financial starvation of challengers, especially in the House but significantly in the Senate as well.

Competition—the lifeblood of democracy—is drying up, because challengers have been almost shut out of the fund-raising game.

The Senate bill addresses this crucial problem only indirectly. It uses voluntary spending ceilings to rein in free-spenders, who are mainly incumbents. It also offers candidates who accept spending limits partial public financing and reduced TV rates. But it distributes these goodies with fine impartiality, evenhandedly rewarding cash-starved challengers and cash-rich incumbents—with their government-paid staffs, offices and mailings, and their easy access to contributors. It does not give challengers one compensatory break.

The House bill will also likely rely on a combination of ceilings and subsidies. But on neither side of the Capitol are the Democrats prepared to do the one thing that might really help challenges—ease the restrictions on fund-raising and spending by the political parties, the only institutions in America that have an intrinsic interest in electing non-incumbents to office.

Indeed, the Senate bill (and likely the House version as well) threatens new restrictions on state parties, limiting the contributions they can accept for coordinated registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns. These efforts are at the heart of electoral democracy, but Congress is threatening to clamp down on them. To call this an improvement takes a greater leap of faith than I can muster.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in addition to that, there are some other people that ought to be referred to that do not have a stake in this. They are not Republicans, and they are not Democrats. These are the scholars out across America, the people who teach and the people who write, the experts. I have searched high and low for a number of years. I am having a hard time finding any academics who support spending limits.

They are troubled not only about the constitutional aspect of it. But even if you can make it constitutional, and you can, the Presidential system is constitutional, but you do not get punished if you choose to speak too much—they say it does not work. It is like putting a rock on jello, and it oozes out to the side in undisclosed and unlimited amounts.

Herbert Alexander, John Bibby, Joel Gora, Michael Malbin, Jonathan Moore, Richard Neustadt, Norman Ornstein, Larry Sabato, Richard Scammon, and on and on—all the top academics in America think spending limits do not work. Some of these people are in favor interestingly enough of public funding as a floor and not as a ceiling. But none of them think that spending limits are a good idea, because they never work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of scholars that I have prepared appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOLARS AGAINST SPENDING LIMITS

Herbert Alexander—Professor, University of Southern California; Director, Citizens' Research Foundation; Director, President Kennedy's Commission on Campaign Costs.

Christopher Arterton—Dean, Graduate School of Political Management, New York. Chair, Campaign Finance Study Group, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Assoc. Professor of Political Science, Yale University. Member, Presidential Nomination and Party Structure of the National Democratic Party.

John Bibby—Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin.

Joel Fleischman—Vice Chancellor, Duke University. Chair, Department of Public Policy Studies, Duke University. Member, Committee on Election Reform and Voter Participation, American Bar Association.

Joel Gora—Associate Professor, Brooklyn Law School Assistant Legal Director, American Civil Liberties Union Winning Counsel, Buckley v. Valeo (1976).

Gary Jacobsen—Associate Professor, University of California, San Diego.

Xandra Kayden—Research Associate, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Director, Women's Advisory Council, McGovern-Shriver Campaign.

Susan King—Assistant to the Commissioner, Federal Election Commission. Chair, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission under President Carter.

Michael Malbin—Assistant Director, House Republican Conference Committee. Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute Editor and Co-author, Money and Politics in the United States.

Nicholas T. Mitropoulos—Assistant Director, Institute of Politics, Harvard University. Senior campaign staffer for George McGovern, Jimmy Carter and Charles Robb.

Jonathan Moore—Director, Institute of Politics, Harvard University.

Richard Neustadt—Lucius N. Littauer Professor, Harvard University. Founding Director, Institute of Politics, Harvard University. Consultant to Presidents Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson. Chair, Platform Committee, 1972 Democratic National Convention.

Gary Orren—Professor, Institute of Politics, Harvard University. Member, Democratic Commission on Presidential Nominations. Director, Polling and Survey Research, Kennedy for President Committee, 1980.

Norman Ornstein—Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

Nelson Polsby—Professor, University of California, Berkeley.

Austin Rammy—Professor, University of California, Berkeley.

Larry Sabato—Associate Professor of Government, University of Virginia.

Richard Scammon—Professor, American University.

Frank Sorauf—Professor, University of Minnesota.

Mr. McCONNELL. They know that spending limits do not work. Of course we have experienced that in the Presidential race. The one big race where we had spending limits by the way, had limiting spending, spending has gone up dramatically in a race with spending limits.

What has happened where we do not have spending limits? Actually, we have had a downward spiral. Spending from 1986 to 1988 in the congressional races where there are no spending limits went down 5 percent. From 1988 to 1990, again congressional races where there are no spending limits, spending declined 10 percent. That is in races without spending limits. In races with spending limits, I think it was roughly a 50-percent increase between 1984 and 1988.

We have heard it said on the floor time and time again over the last 4 or 5 years and again today, about the money chase. And an effort is made to portray Members of Congress as doing nothing but raising money from the day they are sworn in until the day they are defeated or reelected. This is not true, Mr. President. We have studied the cycle. It is just not true. Let us take the class of 1986, the people that will be running this year.

Of the money raised to date, 4 percent was raised in the first 2 years of the 6-year term; 10 percent in the second 2 years of the 6-year term; 6 percent in the last 2 years.

Mr. President, it is pretty clear that in the class of 1982 almost no Senators are spending every day raising money from the beginning of their term. Was 1986 an isolated year, Mr. President? I think not.

Let us look at the class of 1986, those who ran that year. In the first 2 years of that 6-year term they raised 6 percent of the total money that they raised. In the second 2 years, they raised 11 percent; and in the last 2 years, 83 percent.

The class of 1980, those who ran then, going back that 6 years, 9 percent the first 2 years, 11 percent the second 2 years, and 80 percent the last 2 years. No money chase by incumbents, Mr. President. No money chase. Incumbents do raise a lot of money, particularly if they think they are going to have a race. Some incumbents do not raise much money and do not have a race. Some raise a lot of money because they want to win. If they do that, they do it in the last 2 years.

So it is simply incorrect to stand up here year after year and make the argument, which is not supported by the facts, that U.S. Senators serving here in a 6-year term do nothing but go out and raise X amount of money every day, every week. They do not do it.

Mr. President, before I address the conference report before us, I want to talk a minute about where we have been on this issue. Four years ago, in the 100th Congress, Republicans weathered a record eight cloture votes to block a partisan incumbent protection bill that is strikingly similar to the conference report we have before us here today: In all, a third of the Senate's legislative days during that Congress were spent debating this issue.

In the 101st Congress, Republicans allowed the debate to proceed on the Democrats' partisan incumbent-protection bill, hoping that roadblocks to reform, like taxpayer financing and spending limits could be removed and that real campaign reform would finally be achieved. But, unfortunately, the majority did not want that to happen, so it did not happen.

Nearly 1 year ago, early in the 102d Congress, Republicans once again allowed debate to proceed on a partisan taxpayer-funded incumbent protection bill, in the hope that roadblocks to reform could be removed and real reform finally enacted. Once again, on sharply partisan votes, those roadblocks guarded by Democrats and the road to campaign reform was effectively barricaded.

We heard the same tired old cliches: the myth of the money chase I just made reference to the siren song of special interests, and salvation through so-called clean resources—a code word for taxpayers' pocketbooks.

We also saw the same old tired Democratic proposals: spending limits and taxpayer financing. These proposals were destined to go nowhere and the majority knew it when they recycled them again in this Congress.

We have gone around and around and around on this issue for the last three Congresses. We have wasted months and months of legislative time when we could have been addressing issues that America really cares about, like the economy, crime, health care, or certainly the deficit.

We could have passed a campaign reform bill years ago. We knew that in 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991, and we know it this year. Unfortunately, the temptation of the majority, because they have the votes, is to craft the perfect set of rules for them.

If the majority really wanted reform, they would sit down with Republicans, make a list of the areas we can agree on—and we almost did this several years back—like independent expenditures, broadcast discount, like special interest money. We could write a bill that would pass this body almost unanimously.

On the other hand, the majority prefers the status quo. We keep wasting the Senate's time with wornout proposals that most experts on the issue—and I submitted a list of them for the RECORD, Democrat and Republican—rejected as terrible public policy.

This is a truly awful bill, Mr. President. I am embarrassed to think that we are going to pass this thing.

Unfortunately, the majority appears to have chosen the path of posturing, not progress. In the wake of the House check-kiting controversy, the Democratic leadership ran for cover under the campaign finance reform issue.

The majority met together. The Republican leader mentioned a conference a while ago. It was not much of a conference. Basically, the majority met and decided to pass out a bill that had no bipartisan input or cooperation, put together widely differing House and Senate campaign finance bills, dusted them off, and quickly cobbled together a patchwork conference report.

Why? To get something down to the President and try to embarrass him.

Well, the President is eagerly awaiting this bill. His veto pen is full of ink and ready to go. If a political game is what we must play, it seems to me that the politics are clearly on the side of not establishing a new entitlement program for all of us in these times.

My impression, Mr. President, is that the majority really prefers the status quo. They have done well with it. They are in the majority here. It is far better, from their point of view, to pass a bill that has no chance of becoming law, knowing full well that George Bush will take care of it.

Even so, it is faintly humorous that the majority sees their bill as the answer to all of their political problems. The voters are up in arms about check bouncing, congressional perks, the deficit, excessive taxes, and, certainly, contempt for all of us, and insulated incumbents.

So what does the bill do? Mr. President, it writes a check, a rubber check, if you will, to pay for all of our campaigns. The American taxpayers beyond the Beltway get to pay us. We are not quite sure how much, but we know it is going to be a lot. Down here on this line, food stamps for politicians, signed by the majority party.

That is the response. That is the response in this atmosphere.

Mr. President, this is the biggest rubber check in history—to be paid for either through higher taxes, or a bigger deficit in order to fund our campaigns? To fund our campaigns. And to pour a little extra gasoline on the blaze, the bill throws in some choice incumbent protection provisions like spending limits and restriction on support by political parties.

The bill makes it tougher for the parties to support challengers.

As a response to the crisis and public support for this institution, the majority conference report is a little like General Custer showing up early for the Battle of the Little Big Horn. Or Napoleon, selling tickets to Waterloo.

If voters are angry now over political featherbedding and Government waste, just imagine what will happen when congressional taxpayer finance hits the radio talk shows.

I think the other side has really figured it out, because they have blocked our efforts to provide full disclosure to the taxpayers about the public financing perk.

In this body last year, during the debate on S. 3, I offered an amendment requiring that all campaign ads paid for by tax dollars include the following simple disclaimer: "The preceding political advertisement was paid for with taxpayer funds." Concise, honest. I called it "the truth in taxpayer-funded advertising amendment."

I thought it also might appeal to my colleagues across the aisle as a deterrent to negative advertising. You can imagine how voters who already dislike negative ads would feel, knowing they were paying for these ads with their own tax dollars.

Yet my amendment was tabled by a part-line vote. What does that tell you, Mr. President? It says not only did we want to pay for the campaigns with tax dollars; we did not want anybody to know it. We were unwilling to have this truth-in-labeling amendment applied. We are going to take your money out of the Treasury; we are going to pay for political advertising; but we are not going to tell you that you paid for it.

What can you say about that, Mr. President?

So not only did the majority vote to make taxpayers pay for their campaigns; they also voted to hide the fact from the taxpayers. The majority on the House side even invented a nice little euphemism for taxpayer financing, calling it the "Making Democracy Work Fund"—the Make Democracy Work Fund. As Dave Barry says: I am not making this up.

The Democrats plan might be more accurately called a "Make Taxpayers Work Harder Fund" because they are going to have to work a lot harder to pay for these communication vouchers, matching funds, benefits, and the army of bureaucrats required to administer this entitlement program for all of us.

As I have said on frequent occasions, and I say again, Mr. President: You extend something like the Presidential system to 535 additional races, and the FEC is soon going to be the size of the Veterans' Administration—the Veterans' Administration—crawling all over, trying to audit all these tax dollars, used not only for Republicans and Democrats, but for every kook in America who got the newspaper this morning, and while shaving, looked in the mirror and said: By golly, I think I see a Congressman; I think I see a Congressman.

We are going to pay for that. This is our response, at a time when 80 percent of the public is down on Congress? What could sum it up better, that we would think that in this atmosphere, the appropriate response is a measure like this? It is truly astounding.

There are plenty of constituents leaning out windows and saying they are mad as hell at Congress, and they are not going to take it anymore.

I have not heard from the first one—and the Republican leader mentioned this, too—I have not gotten the first letter from anybody at home saying: Sign me up for using my tax dollars to pay for your reelection campaigns. I have not gotten the first letter from anybody saying that. I do not see a groundswell out there for this.

In my own State, we have had some corruption; grand juries investigating members of the Kentucky General Assembly, this kind of thing is quite highlighted. The Kentucky Legislature has recently passed legislation very similar to this which will soon be struck down by the courts.

And yet, in surveys taken by the statewide newspaper, in spite of all the press, on this issue in Kentucky these days, 65 percent of the people—and this is a lot lower than in most States—65 percent of the people said: Do not use my tax dollars for your campaigns. Please do not do that. Please do not reach into the Treasury and use tax dollars for your campaigns. It is the ultimate outrage. You have done everything to us; now you are going to do this to us, too. We are already working to sometime in May to pay the tax bill, and your response to our frustration is to now pay for your campaigns out of the Treasury? They must think we are crazy. "They must be kidding," they are thinking.

But I am sure the majority will say: Well, we would rather not have the food stamps for all of us, but we have to do it in order to have spending limits. That is like saying we need to pass a new spending program in order to raise taxes. The fact is that spending limits are a terrible idea. This may come as a surprise, but spending tax dollars on a terrible idea really does not make it a better idea. Some argue we do that all the time. But it is not a terrific idea.

First of all, spending limits protect incumbents by restricting the ability to challengers to mount effective campaigns. Winning challengers rarely ever outspend the incumbent. In fact, even the successful ones are usually outspent by a wide margin. The incumbent's financial edge is not the decisive issue.

That is always going to be the case.

The key is the challengers must be able to spend enough to compete with the incumbent's established name, legislative record, franking privileges, and other advantages. Not only that, but challengers also have to convince voters it is time for a change. That is an expensive undertaking. Spending limits unavoidably handicap the challenger's ability to do that.

Mr. President, I teach a class on American political parties in elections every week. I am pretty familiar with this subject. There is a lot written about spending on behalf of incumbents and whether or not it helps.

It is pretty clearly a trend of scholars that say beyond a certain point, spending for incumbents just is not

that effective. So it is not in and of itself significant when you say incumbents outspend challengers. Of course, they do. The critical component part is whether the challenger has enough to get his message across. Of course, he or she will be outspent. Of course. But spending beyond a certain point for an incumbent does not make any difference. The critical element is whether challengers have enough.

Spending limits do not level the playing field between incumbents and challengers. You may as well put Pee-wee Herman and Evander Holyfield in the boxing ring together, and then try to make it equal by tying one arm behind each of their backs. It just does not work that way.

The truth is the most expensive elections are those in which the incumbent faces serious competition. Both the incumbent and the challenger raise a lot of small donations from the supporters and spend it trying to reach and persuade the voters.

What is wrong with that? What is wrong with that, Mr. President? That is competition.

Almost invariably, high-spending races generate high turnout. I am having a hard time finding out what is wrong with that.

In competitive races, the parties jump in and spend a lot of money, usually to boost the challenger. I am having a hard time trying to figure out what is wrong with that.

These are all signs of a healthy, robust democracy. We are not members of the House of Lords. We do not own these seats. Nobody gave us a lifetime tenure, and we ought to have to fight for them. But the majority apparently wants to clamp down on competitive challengers and robust political parties through spending limits on campaigns.

What is truly misguided about the Democrats' agenda, however, is that, of course, spending limits do not work. Even if it were sound public policy to limit spending in political campaigns, and it is not, spending limits do not limit spending. They do not limit spending at all. And there is ample proof of this in the Presidential system.

We are wasting valuable legislative resources, and potentially a lot of taxpayer money, on an idea that is totally discredited. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund and the spending limits it props up are a failed Government program. Every reputable scholar—and I have already submitted the list; liberal or conservative, Republican or Democrat—who studied the system concluded it is an unmitigated disaster; unmitigated disaster.

Spending has gone up in every single Presidential election. The rate of growth has now far exceeded the growth of spending in congressional races. As a matter of fact, it has gone down in congressional races.

In other words, campaign spending, under spending limits, goes up faster than campaign spending without spending limits.

If that is hard to fathom, remember what prohibition did to the proliferation of drinking establishments. What has happened in the Presidential system is that individual fat cats and well-organized special interests have figured out loopholes in the limits.

While we are talking about the Presidential system, the President, of course, is always criticized for being against this bill. As I said a couple of hours ago when we started, criticizing the President for saying he is going to veto this bill because he has accepted public funding in the Presidential races is like saying because the House has a bank, the Senate ought to have a bank.

Now, the truth of the matter is all candidates under the Presidential system have accepted the public funds except one. And the reason they did it is because it is a very generous subsidy. And, or course, that is what would happen here. It would become an enormous, generous subsidy, and it would really cost a lot of money as we funded not only Republicans and Democrats but crooks and crackpots all across America right out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Instead of cleaning up politics, spending limits have encouraged off-the-books, unreported, unlimited campaign spending the special interests. Most important, all of the devices used to evade the limits favor the well organized and powerful over smaller, unsophisticated participants.

Michael Malbin, of the Rockefeller Institute, is one of the outstanding experts on this issue. He said:

> [Spending limits] encourage the powerful to engage in subterfuge and legal gamesmanship. It is giving them an incentive to increase their influence in ways that are poorly disclosed. As a cure for cynicism or corruption, this seems bizarre.

Frankly, there is no better word to describe spending limits than "bizarre."

What is even more bizarre, however, is the majority's obsession with replicating the billion-dollar boondoggle of the Presidential system in all 535 congressional races.

Fringe candidates like Lenora Fulani and Lyndon LaRouche—who have milked the taxpayers for millions of dollars—would sprout like kudzu in congressional races all over the country. Free taxpayer dollars to put your face on TV. They would be lining up all across America. The line begins outside the Treasury.

Maybe David Duke had a little trouble qualifying for matching funds under the Presidential system. He got started a little late. He would have made it if he started a little sooner because it is pretty easy. But this conference report, if it ever became law, would put old David Duke right back in business again and provide public subsidies for him to combat anybody who dared criticize him. What a terrific idea. The American people are going to really applaud this bill once they figure out what is in it.

But, even if you were convinced that the world was flat and that spending limits were a good idea, this report, this conference report, contains only pseudo-spending limits. Unlike the Presidential system where the lawyers had to work hard to find all the loopholes, this package comes with the loopholes already built in.

For example, there is a provision allowing a special, unlimited exemption for all legal and compliance costs in House races. That loophole is big enough to drive a truckload of lawyers and accountants through—a truckload of lawyers and accountants. They are going to welcome this bill if it ever becomes law. Fortunately, it will not, but, boy, would they love it. In fact, the lawyers and accountants would make a fortune exploiting all the nooks and crannies of this bill. Maybe this is the majority's idea of an economic recovery package. Start with the candidates themselves and then sort of trickle down to the lawyers and accountants.

Further, while the Democrats' bill virtually padlocks the political parties, restricting every form of party soft money, it does absolutely nothing—nothing—about special interest soft money. Special interest soft money, otherwise known as sewer money, is flatly ignored by this conference report. The millions of dollars that labor unions and tax-exempt corporations spend every year to influence elections are not touched at all in this bill.

Presumably, this is not a drafting error. I do not think this was an unintentional omission. It could not be an oversight. Senator HATCH made an extraordinary appeal to the Democrats last year to deal with this scandalous problem.

Mr. President, what we have before us is a bill that turns a blind eye to the hundreds of millions of dollars labor unions spend to influence Federal elections. This is sewer money, and it is stinking up the political process. Perhaps my colleagues across the aisle are suffering from hay fever and cannot smell it, but every Republican candidate would get a big whiff in November.

The cynic in me suspects there is a partisan motivation behind this glaring loophole, a hole so big you could drive the Teamster semi-truck that sometime parks down at the AFL–CIO headquarters right through it.

And the majority purport to call this a spending limit bill? This bill, a spending limit bill, with this kind of loophole in it?

Mr. President, this is a "limit Republican spending bill." It is a "limit chal-

lenger's spending bill." This is not a "limit Democrat's spending bill." This is not a "limit special interest labor union spending bill."

Mr. President, with all due respect to my colleagues on the other side who believe, apparently strongly, in this bill, this bill is indeed a sham. You cannot constitutionally force spending limits. We cannot force them. You cannot, practically, limit spending. You can make candidates go through all kinds of hoops to get their message out; you can force interested participants in our Nation's political process to devise all kinds of creative means to circumvent the limits.

Mr. President, in the end, when all is said and done, whether this bill passes or does not pass, people are going to participate in politics. They insist on it. It is their government. They have a right to it. Whether or not you spend the entire peace dividend on taxpayer-funded political campaigns, people will participate. They will spend money over and above the limits set forth in this campaign finance bill. This is, after all, a democracy. The first amendment to the Constitution protects political speech. The American spirit dictates that it will ever be thus.

Mr. President, taxpayer-financing and spending limits are areas Republicans and Democrats have never agreed on and never will. PAC contributions was an issue that, for a time, Senate Democrat and Republican bills did concur about.

Some years ago, I was the first, along with some other Republicans, to propose a unilateral ban on PAC contributions. PAC's, really, personify special-interest influence. They are a tool of incumbents who receive virtually all the PAC contributions. As the public has learned more about the ways PAC's operate, their disdain for this special-interest machine has intensified.

After getting beat up by the press and Common Cause, the majority, a couple of days before the debate was scheduled to begin in 1990, adopted the Republican PAC-ban. Frankly, it was a change that I welcomed, having first proposed it, and took some satisfaction in forcing. From then on the majority railed against PAC's and parade their get-tough PAC provision. It appeared we were in harmony on an issue.

But, Mr. President, a sour note was struck last week when the Democrat's conference report was unveiled. Voila, the PAC-ban had disappeared. The PAC's were back. In its place were PAC-protected provisions for Senate Democrats and for House Democrats. It appears some Democrats envisioned a PAC-less future and did not like what they saw.

To be honest, Mr. President, I almost had to laugh.

Everyone knew 2 years ago the Democrats had adopted the PAC-ban with a wink and with a nod. Last week when crunch time came, the majority blinked. Now, Mr. President, there is not a chance in a million this bill is going to become law. Yet the majority did not want to take even the smallest risk—not even the smallest risk—presumably out of fear that the President might wake up and have a change of heart on this issue, would not even take the smallest risk that they would lose the political lifeline, the political action committees.

In addition, Mr. President, the height of hypocrisy was reached when the conferees could not even bring themselves to draft a report that has the same rules for the Senate as for the House. What do we have conferences for? Anyone can paste two bills together and call it a conference report. It does take some effort, however, to reconcile differences and to mold a cohesive report. This conference report certainly fails on that point. This bill is a lawyer's dream. It sets up a byzantine array of separate rules for the House and for the Senate.

What happens, for example, when House Members run for Senate seats? Who knows. Fortunately, Mr. President this bill is not going to become law. My suspicion is if there had been any real thought it would become law it would not look like this, would not look like this at all.

I just outlined the reasons why this is a horrible bill. And those are the reasons that President Bush is going to veto it. During the debate a year ago on S. 3, I entered into the RECORD several times a letter from the President to me, which is still operative and covers this conference report. I highlighted a particular passage that the President wrote, and this is what he said:

> I intend to veto any campaign finance reform legislation which features spending limits or taxpayer financing of congressional campaigns.

Further, the President said:

> I am deeply opposed to campaign finance legislation that proposes different rules concerning political action committees for the House and for the Senate. We must not further Balkanize ethics in election reform.

That was the President on a similar piece of legislation last year.

This bill is going to be vetoed, thank goodness, and I know there will be great sighs of relief from a clear majority on the other side that it is. This bill is a cynical attempt to seize the mantle of reform, knowing full well its failure assures the status quo.

What is a mystery to me, Mr. President is that anybody thinks voting for this bill is good politics. Since this is entirely a political exercise, unfortunately, and not a serious exercise, not an exercise to design legislation to become law, then we can only judge it on political terms, since it is a totally politically exercise.

I find it astonishing that anybody would think that voting for this would be a smart thing to do politically. Eighty percent of the American people think the Congress is a mess and in our zeal to confirm their judgment, we are going to write a blank check to pay for our political campaigns and the political campaign of every nut and crackpot in America who wants to reach into the cookie jar called the Federal Treasury and go out and have an ego trip paid for at public expense.

I think, Mr. President, that if the American people had any idea what was in this bill—and certainly I think since this is a totally political exercise there is nothing wrong with our side making efforts, as great an effort as it can, to make sure the word does get out—the American people would be outraged. If it is possible to fall any lower in their esteem, I would venture that we would; that if every voter were fully informed of what this bill is about, the esteem for Congress would fall even lower, and you would not think you can go beyond 80 percent disapproval. I think that is probably unparalleled in the annals of polling. It is astonishing to think it could fall any lower, but I am confident, Mr. President, that if they knew what this was all about, they would dislike us even more.

And they certainly would say this sums it up. I can hear them saying out there, all across America, you want to limit my opportunity to participate on behalf of a candidate of my choice voluntarily, and you want to take my money involuntarily and give it to people that I do not approve of, and you think that is the way to restore my confidence in Congress? It is an astonishing development.

Fortunately, the President of the United States is going to save the people from this monstrosity and, frankly, if Republicans had an opportunity, I think a clear majority of them would repeal the Presidential system. It has been a disgrace and a disaster. But at the very least as a result of divided Government, the fact the people in their wisdom chose a President of one party and a Congress of another, at the very least, we do not have to take this madness any further. We can confine this idiocy to one race, the Presidential race, and not spread it any further, and not spend public money on 535 additional races at a cost of millions and millions of dollars to the American taxpayers.

So, Mr. President, at some point in the next couple of days, we will have our vote largely along partisan lines, and there will be plenty enough support for the President to sustain his veto comfortably. It is a vote that in my view Republicans can feel good about. We fought the good fight now for 5 years. We tried very, very hard to have responsible reform that did not tilt the playing field either way, the kind of bipartisan campaign finance re-

form bill that we knew 5 years ago we could have passed. It would not have helped the Democrats at the expense of the Republicans or helped the Republicans at the expense of the Democrats.

But, no, we chose not to do that, Mr. President. We chose not to do that. We chose to ram through, on a partisan basis, a new entitlement program for us that attempted to quantify and limit speech inconsistent with the first amendment, attempted to push people out of the political process in the one way that most people participate these days, other than voting, and that is by making a small and disclosable contribution to the candidate of their choice, and substitute in lieu thereof tax dollars, an astonishing reaction to the current dilemma in which Congress finds itself.

And so, Mr. President, I hold out no hope that any minds are going to be changed at this late date. We have hashed this out for 5 years now. I am disappointed. I do not like the status quo. I know Senator BOREN is disappointed. We see this issue somewhat differently, but both of us, I think, would like to see something some day become law. Unfortunately, the temptation when writing the rules of the game in which we all participate, is for the majority to write the rules in a way that will benefit them. I do not blame them for trying, but it is not going to work. This is not ever going to become law.

I go beyond that, Mr. President, in closing, for the moment, and say even if by some quirk something similar to this became law, it would not be law very long. This bill would not have a snowball's chance in hell of surviving the Federal courts. It is dead on arrival. The Supreme Court is not going to allow this kind of trashing of the first amendment.

So I hope, no matter who is President, no matter who is in the majority of Congress, at some point we will get down to the serious business of writing a bipartisan campaign finance bill that is constitutional. This one clearly is not.

Madam President, I yield the floor in honor of your arrival.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MIKULSKI). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Madam President, I have listened with interest to my colleague from Kentucky. As he has said, we have been debating this issue now for a few years and are certainly familiar with the arguments that each one of us would raise in the course of this debate. But I think we really need to get to the heart of the issue.

The heart of the issue, in spite of the check that has been brought to the floor and used as a prop today by my friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle, it is not a question of public financing. The Senator from Kentucky knows that this Senator is not a person who is enthusiastic about the subject of public financing. He also knows that this Senator is not motivated by some desire to gain a partisan advantage for one particular side of the aisle over the other in terms of reforming the way we finance campaigns in this country.

In fact—and I believe it was a year before the Senator from Kentucky came to the Senate—I joined with the distinguished Senator at that time, Senator Goldwater, in offering a bipartisan proposal to try to change the way that we finance campaigns in this country by reducing the influence of special interests, political action committees, known as PAC's, in the process. And since that effort began the situation has gotten worse and worse and worse, with over half the Members of Congress receiving more than half of their total campaign contributions not from people back home, not from the participants at the grass roots that the Senator from Kentucky has described, but from political action committees, special interest groups, most of them located outside of the Senator or Congressman's home district and home State to raise money to influence elections; more than half of all the money not coming from the people back home but coming from the special interest groups located elsewhere.

Madam President, I remember a meeting that I attended not too many years ago where a group of managers of political action committees, PAC's were together in a meeting, I believe about 200 managers of political action committees.

And I recall one of them from the floor challenging my suggestion it would be healthier for the political process in this country if we had limits on campaign spending and if the contributions raised to finance campaigns came not from the lobbyists and lobbying groups in Washington but from the people back home. This manager of a political action committee got up and purported to quote a Member I believe at that time of the House of Representatives by saying: "Senator, don't you think it would be better if we could just raise all the money here?" He said, "I was talking to a Member of Congress the other day who said, 'You know, I like raising all the money for my campaign here. We can have a big fund raiser here in Washington and raise several hundred thousand dollars and that way I don't have to go back home to my friends and neighbors in my home State and in my home district and embarrass myself and inconvenience my own constituents back home by asking them to contribute money to finance my campaign. I don't have to hit them up for contributions or ask them to give money to my campaigns because I would raise it all here in Washington from the political action committees." don't you think," he said, "that is a lot better way of raising campaign funds than to have to go back to your home State and your home district and raise contributions that way?"

It would appear a number of people seemed to agree with that since more than half the money is coming from such special interest groups in Washington instead of from the people back home.

Madam President, my answer to him was: "Thank God the Constitution requires us to inconvenience the people back home to vote in the elections or we could just do it all with the special interest groups here in Washington, DC, and not bother or inconvenience the people back home by asking them to participate in the process at all."

Madam President, that indicates just how far we have come in terms of distorting the political process of this country. There is really but one difference of opinion between us, one difference of opinion that we have not been able to reconcile on two sides of the aisle.

It is not the constitutionality of a system that would put in place voluntary spending limits. As has already been indicated by the distinguished majority leader, there is such a system in the Presidential election process and it is a system that has been accepted by candidates on both sides of the aisle including, and I say this not in criticism but simply as a matter of fact, the current President of the United States, President Bush, who has accepted those voluntary spending limits under the Presidential system and who has accepted some $200 million in matching funds from the Public Treasury under that system. So there seems to be no difference of opinion about that. There could be a constitutional system that would put in place voluntary spending limits.

Nor, Madam President, do I think it would be impossible to work out some sort of system that would hold to a minimum any exposure to the taxpayers. In fact, this bill, in spite of the check that was brought to the floor signed "the Democrats," new perk for Members of Congress, in spite of that prop which was brought to the floor, the language of this bill, if our colleagues from the other side of the aisle would read the conference report, says in black and white that we would not use general revenues from the taxpayers to fund any of the benefits provided in this bill.

There are alternatives. There is a voluntary checkoff system that we can hope the American people voluntarily would care enough about cleaning up the political system, that that itself would be sufficient to finance any incentives that are necessary to get people to accept spending limits. I, for one, think we all too often underestimate the patriotism and the desire of

the American people to make a contribution back to their own political system.

But, Madam President, the real difference of opinion exists on one and only one subject. We can work out the rest.

We can work out how much political parties could give to the individual candidates. That is not insurmountable. On numerous occasions in negotiations we have indicated a willingness to allow a greater role by the political parties.

We can hold to a bare minimum the amount of incentives that would be given, whether it is lower mailing rates which have been supported by those on the other side of the aisle, or lower broadcast rates mentioned by the Senator from Kentucky with approval, which is also provided in this conference report.

We could work out a series of incentives for voluntary spending limits that would hold to a bare minimum, virtually to very little if any at all, none coming from general revenues, sufficient incentives to bring about voluntary spending limits. It is the spending limits, Madam President, if you listen to the discussion that has occurred on the floor over the last hour, it is the spending limits that are the issue, the spending limits referred to by my colleague from Kentucky as an effort to trash the first amendment.

Madam President, there is simply an honest difference of opinion on this issue. It is obvious that there are those on the other side of the aisle, including my colleague from Kentucky, who believe that it is good and healthy and an excellent form of political participation for people to pour more and more and more money into the political election process. They define participation as the contribution of money to the process.

Madam President, there is simply a difference of opinion as to this matter. I for one, and I would believe many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I suspect, had this not become a polarized issue somewhat along party lines, there are many on the other side of the aisle as we would tell you in private conversation that they are disturbed by the amount of money that it takes to run for office in this country today.

Is it a good thing? Madam President, is it a good thing that the cost of successfully running for the U.S. Senate has gone from $600,000 14 years ago to $4 million today? Is that a good thing?

I do not think it is a good thing. I do not think it is good for the political process in this country. If it is not a good thing, if it is destructive of the political process in this country that more and more and more elections are being determined by who can raise the most money, that more and more of the energy in political campaigns must go into the raising of money instead of into the debating of issues and qualifications of candidates, then we must try to do something to stop it.

To those who believe that we can, who say let us go ahead and let us have campaign finance reform, let us go and write a bill on those things that we can agree about. I am pleased that there is greater agreement about reducing the influence of PAC's.

I point out to my good friend from Kentucky, as I have already pointed out in introducing the conference report on the floor, that if he wants to reduce the influence of political action committees and PAC's, join us: vote for this conference committee report. If the limits of this conference committee report had been in place in the 1990 election cycle, the amount of money the political action committees, PAC's, could have given would have been reduced by 5 percent, more than cut in half.

So we have an opportunity to do something about it. If we are interested in shutting off the sewer money, as it has been referred to—and I agree with that designation 100 percent—the so-called soft money, there is an opportunity to do something about it: Vote for this conference report.

If it takes every single contribution made for the purpose of influencing a Federal election, whether it is run by a State party under the guise of a get-out-the-vote effort or some other guise when it influences the Federal election campaign and defines it as an expenditure to influence a Federal election, bringing that under the contribution limits of Federal law of so many pennies per voter, so it stops it; there would be no more soft money under this bill. All contributions would be defined under one standard and the loophole would be closed.

But, Madam President, where I cannot agree is that we could go ahead and pass real campaign finance reform by drawing up a list of 10 or 12 things we could agree about, and passing them into law, say now we have done it, and omit any limit on spending.

How in the world can we say that we had genuine campaign finance reform when we do nothing to stop the increasing amount of money pouring into American politics? To me that is like the mother who said to her daughter, "Yes, dear you may go swimming, but you may not go near the water." There is simply no way in the world to deal with this problem until we deal with the heart and soul of it: Too much money pouring into American politics, corrupting the system.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas, the minority leader, for whom I have the greatest respect in talking about the latest Gallup poll which showed that 80 percent of the American people have lost confidence in the Congress, said he thought that many people had lost confidence in the Congress because they believed that the special interest groups control this institution instead of the people. That that was the perception.

Why is it the perception? It is because we have come to define participation in our politics not by voting, not by discussing the issues, not by knocking on doors, not by talking to our neighbors, not by advocating the causes in candidates that we believe in, but because we have come to define participation as the giving and conveying of money. And, therefore, those who have greater amounts of money to give and to convey and to pour into the system have more influence than those who do not.

That is at the heart of it. That is why the American people believe that the special interests have more sway in this institution than they have. That is why middle-income Americans believe that they are getting shortchanged, that their numbers are shrinking. That is why they believe that in the past decade the incomes of the top 1 percent in this country have gone up substantially by more than 20 percent in real terms while the incomes of middle-income Americans have shrunk.

That is why they believe that they continue to have to struggle to send their children to college with tax bills passed through this institution that give further tax cuts to those who need them least while middle-income families are not even allowed to deduct the interest on college loans that they have to take out to struggle to send their children to college.

Why do they think, Madam President, that the special interests have more influence in this institution than they? Everyone has an equal vote in this country. If elections were decided principally on the basis of the ability of people to get out and campaign, vote, debate, and knock on doors, we all have an equal opportunity to do that—no. It is the perception that money is the determining the outcome of the elections. Why not? We heard the figures earlier. In 93 percent of the elections there is a correlation. The candidate with the most money wins.

Madam President, the figures speak for themselves. There was an argument raised a moment ago that to put a limit on spending—this is something I really do not understand—would be disadvantageous to the challengers, that if we pass a bill like this bill that puts in place according to limited spending by candidates that will hurt challengers.

If those on the other side of the aisle really believe that, I am concerned about the analytical method that they are using to examine this issue, if they really believe that.

Let us just think for a moment. If incumbents when you do not have spending limits, here we have a system with

no limits—incumbents last time raised eight times as much money in the House as challengers. There is a 93-percent correlation between those who win and those who raise the most money. How in the world can a system of unlimited spending be said to favor challengers when incumbents can raise eight times as much as they can? How can a system with unlimited spending be said to favor challengers when the special interest groups this year, the political action committees, are pouring in $25 into the campaign funds of incumbents for every dollar they are putting into the campaign funds for challengers?

Let us look at the facts. I have to say again that I do not understand and I sometimes have to convince my colleagues on our side of the aisle where we are in the majority, that I am not in league with those on the other side of the aisle in advocating spending limits because they also know the figures. You would think that any party that was in the minority in Congress today with the apparent fact that an incumbent, not a Democrat, not a Republican, it does not matter whether they are a Democrat or a Republican.

They were asked specifically, "Do you favor the Boren bill?" Eighty-two percent said "yes," a vast majority of Republicans and Democrats. This is not an issue on which Republicans and Democrats differ. The vast majority of both favor spending limits.

It is hard for me to understand why those who happen to be Republicans and are now serving in Congress depart in their thinking so completely from their own constituents and their own party members back home. Maybe it is because they are incumbents, also, and deep down, they understand the fact that they have a great advantage, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, in that they are incumbents. Maybe that is at the heart of their reluctance to change.

There are some Republicans who do want to change. A very interesting news release put out by the group Public Citizen, dated Monday, April 20 said: "Thirty-two past and present Republican challengers from 22 States today called on President Bush to sign landmark congressional campaign finance reform legislation recently passed by the House," and now pending in the Senate.

The money chase is not going away, as my colleague seems to want to indicate. He said it slowed down somewhat in 1990, the increase in spending. That is not true. It might have appeared to have slowed down in the aggregate because more of the elections in 1990 were in smaller States, where lesser amounts of money are usually spent than was the case in the two preceding election cycles.

But when you look at the amount spent per voter in the States where elections were held in 1990, that amount went up by 40 cents from 1988 to $1.70 per voter; this was campaign spending. In 1980, candidates were spending 60 cents per voter to run successful races. In 1990, it rose to $1.70, up from $1.30 per voter in 1988. So it continues to spiral. It continues to go up.

Madam President, is it a good thing? That is the essence of the debate. Is it a good thing that more and more money is being poured into the process? I think with all sincerity—and I wish I could change the Senator's mind—I believe my friend from Kentucky believes it is a good thing. He believes it indicates more participation in political campaigns.

I do not think it is a good thing. I do not think pouring more and more money into campaigns is the kind of political participation we want to encourage. Yes, we want to encourage voting. A serious debate of the issues, yes; we want to encourage that. Volunteering one's time and caring enough about the political process to knock on doors on the road where a person lives, or in the block or neighborhood where a person happens to live, to convince friends and neighbors to support a candidate—that person might be supporting himself or herself—yes, we want to encourage that kind of participation. Putting yard signs in our front yards, we want to encourage that kind of participation. But runaway campaign spending is not the kind of participation that is helping the American political process.

Can we really say that the fact that we have gone from $600,000 to $4 million to run a U.S. Senate campaign has helped the quality of American politics? Can we say that in the last two or three elections, we have had a better discussion of the important issues and more involvement of the American people and of the important decisions affecting this country than we had when campaigns cost a lot less to run successfully? Can we really say we have encouraged more good, new, young people with fresh ideas to come into politics?

How in the world can we think it would encourage new people to come into politics when they have to face the fact that they have to raise millions of dollars to get in the front door? How in the world does it encourage new people to get into politics when they know that while they might be able to go out successfully in their home States and communities at the grassroots and raise some money from small contributors up and down the streets of their home communities, but be faced with the fact that at the last minute a flood of money could come in from Washington at the rate of $25 to every $1 from the political action committees located here, from those multi-million-dollar fundraisers that can be held on a single night, and will be held again tonight in Washington? When we read the morning paper, we will probably read that the fundraiser held tonight here may break all records. Perhaps it will set the record for American politics.

Every time I read a headline that says this year they raised more than last year, particularly in Washington, particularly from the special interest groups, it is simply a message to me that it is a further distortion of the political process and further discouragement to the average American from participating, because they think the dollars are going to add up more than the votes, when all is said and done.

So, Madam President, that is the nub of it. That is the difference of opinion we have not been able to get over. We could work out a bundle of incentives that would keep the American taxpayer from having to dig down in his or her pocket and finance the incentives that would be sufficient to get candidates to accept voluntary spending limits. We have discounted broadcast time. We have disclaimers under our bill that would require candidates that do not accept spending limits to so state on their advertising.

These are the kinds of things that would encourage candidates, without cost to the taxpayers, to accept voluntary spending limits. There are ways of devising bills to do that. We have simply not been able to get an agreement on the basic concept that the money chase is bad for American politics, that too much money is pouring into the system, that too much time is being spent raising it.

The Senator from Kentucky said, well, it is not as serious as you say, because after all, most Members do not sit down and raise $13,000 every single week for 6 years. So it really does not take that much of their time. They usually wait and raise most of it in the last 2 years.

If you do that, to put the arithmetic to that, you find, if they wait until the last 2 years and in panic try to raise nearly all of it at that time, then they may not raise it for the first 4 years, but they have to raise $43,000 a week for the last 2 years to come up with the amount of money. Maybe that is not so bad. Well, I do not see how it is good.

Madam President, it is just human nature, and I go back to the point that if a Member of the Senate of the United States or a challenger, indeed, for a Senate seat has 5 minutes to give to a constituent to discuss a problem or to hear their opinion, and that candidate is desperate to raise the money it takes to get on television or radio and buy advertising, desperate to raise that money because it takes $4 million, and that person has 5 minutes to spare and there are 10 people lined up to give their views to that candidate or that Senator or that Congressman, or one of them, human nature being what it is, there is someone sitting there that has

the capacity of giving the candidate $1,000 or perhaps holding a fundraiser in their home where they might raise $50,000, or better yet, putting together a committee in Washington that might raise that candidate $300,000 or $400,000, and there is someone who works for a living with their hands on an assembly line or who sits on a tractor in the hot Sun on a farm, that if they really made a sacrifice might be able to contribute $10 or $5 to the campaign instead of $5,000 or $10,000, and has no ability to organize a committee to raise $300,000, human nature being what it is, and thinking they are not going to win the election if they do not raise the $4 million, with which person are they going to spend that 5 minutes?

Madam President, I think we all know the answer. It is not a matter of being bought and paid for. It is not a matter of anyone consciously sitting down and saying, "I am going to sell myself to the highest bidder," but it is a process that nobody feels good about. The sensitive, caring Member of Congress who came here because he or she wanted to make a difference to this country does not feel good about the pressure placed upon them to raise the amount of money that it now takes, and the citizen obviously does not feel good about it either. That is why that citizen, when queried by the Gallup poll or the Harris poll or some other polling organization, says, "I do not have confidence in Congress anymore. I believe they belong to the special interests and not to me." And which one of us, in all honesty, as long as we allow runaway campaign spending and that pressure to be put on every candidate, whether they are in office or out, man or woman, Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative, as long as that pressure is there to raise $4 million to run a successful race to the U.S. Senate, can look that constituent in the eye, that disillusioned citizen in the eye, and say, "Money does not matter. The opinion of a person without a dime to contribute to a campaign matters as much to a candidate as a person that can raise $1,000 or $10,000 or $100,000." Madam President, we cannot do that. And we all know it.

So that is the difference of opinion. There are those of us who do not believe it is healthy that it takes $4 million on the average to win a U.S. Senate race. That is the difference of opinion. There are those of us who believe that the heart of reform is to limit runaway campaign spending, to squeeze the excess money out of the system and put competition back in the arena of ideas and qualifications where it belongs. That is the issue. And that is the reason the American people, 82 percent of them, Democrat and Republican alike, have said, "We favor limits on campaign spending." Madam President, let us not shirk our duty. Let us not let the people down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on adoption of the conference report accompanying S. 3, the Senate Election Ethics Act, occur at 3:30 p.m., Thursday, April 30; that on Thursday, the Senate resume consideration of the conference report at 1 p.m., with the time from 1 p.m. until 3 p.m. equally divided and controlled between Senators BOREN and MCCONNELL, the time from 3 p.m. until 3:15 p.m. under the control of the Republican leader, and the time from 3:15 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. under the control of the majority leader; that at 3:30 p.m., without intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on the adoption of the conference report accompanying S. 3, the Senate Election Ethics Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the majority leader's request?

Mr. DOLE. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the agreement is as follows:

Ordered, That at 1 p.m., on Thursday, April 30, 1992, the Senate resume consideration of the conference report accompanying S. 3, the Senate Election Ethics Act.

Ordered further, That the time from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Boren) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McConnell); the time from 3 p.m. to 3:15 p.m. be under the control of the Republican Leader; and that the time from 3:15 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. be under the control of the Majority Leader.

Ordered further, That at 3:30 p.m. without intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report accompanying S. 3.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank my colleagues, and I thank the distinguished Republican leader for his courtesy.

Senators should now be aware, then, that the vote on this conference report will occur at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday. There will be a full day for debate tomorrow. Any Senator who wishes to debate, to address the subject in any way should be present tomorrow for that debate.

On Thursday, there will be 2½ hours of debate equally divided and controlled. Senators BOREN and MCCONNELL will control 1 hour each between 1 and 3 p.m., Senator DOLE will control 15 minutes from 3 to 3:15 p.m., and I will control 15 minutes, from 3:15 to 3:30 p.m. and have the vote at that time.

I thank my colleagues. And, Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 230

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 959(b)), I am pleased to transmit herewith the 25th Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities for fiscal year 1991.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 28, 1992.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 231

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 204(f) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3015(f)), I hereby transmit the Annual Report for 1991 of the Federal Council on the Aging. The report reflects the Council's views in its role of examining programs serving older Americans.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 28, 1992.*

JOB TRAINING 2000 ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 232

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and enactment the Job Training 2000 Act. This legislation would reform the Federal vocational training system to meet the Nation's work force needs into the 21st century by establishing: (1) a network of local skill centers to serve as a common point of entry to vocational training; (2) a certification system to ensure that only high quality vocational training programs receive Federal funds; and (3) a voucher system for vocational training to enhance participant choice.

Currently, a myriad of programs administered by a number of Federal agencies offer vocational education and job training at a cost of billions of dollars each year. This investment in the federally supported education and training system should provide opportunities to acquire the vital skills to succeed in a changing economy. Unfortunately, the current reality is that services are disjointed, and administration is inefficient. Few individuals—especially young, low-income, unskilled people—are able to obtain crucial information on the quality of training programs and the job opportunities and skill requirements in the fields for which training is available.

The Job Training 2000 Act transforms this maze of programs into a vocational training system responsive to the needs of individuals, business, and the national economy.

Four key principles underlie the Job Training 2000 Act. First, the proposal is designed to simplify and coordinate services for individuals seeking vocational training or information relating to such training. Second, it would decentralize decisionmaking and create a flexible service delivery structure for public programs that reflects local labor market conditions. Third, it would ensure high standards of quality and accountability for federally funded vocational training programs. Fourth, it would encourage greater and more effective private sector involvement in the vocational training programs.

The Job Training 2000 initiative would be coordinated through the Private Industry Councils [PIC's] formed under the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA]. PIC's are the public/private governing boards that oversee local job training programs in nearly 650 JTPA service delivery areas. A majority of PIC members are private sector representatives. Other members are from educational agencies, labor, community-based organizations, the public Employment Service, and economic development agencies.

Under the Job Training 2000 Act, the benefits of business community input, now available only to JTPA, would enhance other Federal vocational training programs. PIC's would form the management core of the Job Training 2000 system and would oversee skill centers, certify—in conjunction with State agencies—federally funded vocational training programs, and manage the vocational training voucher system. Under this system, PIC's would be accountable to Governors for their activities, who in turn would report on performance to a Federal vocational training council.

The skill centers would be established under this act as a one-stop entry point to provide workers and employers with easy access to information about vocational training, labor markets, and other services available throughout the community. The skill centers would be designated by the local PIC's after consultations within the local community. These centers would replace the dozens of entry points now in each community. Centers would present a coherent menu of options and services to individuals seeking assistance: assessment of skill levels and service needs, information on occupations and earnings, career counseling and planning, employability development, information on federally funded vocational training programs, and referrals to agencies and programs providing a wide range of services.

The skill centers would enter into written agreements regarding their operation with participating Federal vocational training programs. The programs would agree to provide certain core services only through the skill centers and would transfer sufficient resources to the skill centers to provide such services. These provisions would ensure improved client access, minimize duplication, and enhance the effectiveness of vocational training programs.

The Job Training 2000 Act also would establish a certification system for Federal vocational training that is based on performance. To be eligible to receive Federal vocational training funds, a program would have to provide effective training as measured by outcomes, including job placement, retention, and earnings. The PIC, in conjunction with the designated State agency, would certify programs that meet these standards. This system would increase the availability of information to clients regarding the performance of vocational training programs and ensure that Federal funds are only used for quality programs.

For the most part, vocational training provided under JTPA, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, postsecondary only, and the Food Stamp Employment and Training program would be provided through a voucher system. The voucher system would be operated under a local agreement between the PIC and covered programs. The system would provide participants with the opportunity to choose from among certified service providers. The vouchers would also contain financial incentives for successful training outcomes. By promoting choice and competition among service providers, the establishment of this system would enhance the quality of vocational training.

This legislation provides an important opportunity to improve services to youths and adults needing to raise their skills for the labor market by focusing on the consumers's needs rather than preserving outmoded and disjointed traditional approaches. Enactment of this legislation would make significant contributions to the country's competitiveness by enhancing the opportunities available to our current and future workers and increasing the skills and productivity of our work force.

I urge the Congress to give this legislation prompt and favorable consideration.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 28, 1992.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 15, 1992, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 4572. An act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to grant a waiver of the requirement limiting the maximum number of individuals enrolled with a health maintenance organization who may be beneficiaries under the medicare or medicaid programs in order to enable the Dayton Area Health Plan, Inc. to continue to provide services through January 1994 to individuals residing in Montgomery County, Ohio, who are enrolled under a State plan for medical assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act; and

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to George Mason.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the enrolled bill and joint resolution were signed on April 15, 1992, during the recess of the Senate, by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, an-

nounced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2454) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to impose disbarments and other penalties for illegal activities involving the approval of abbreviated drug applications under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2967) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995; to authorize a 1993 National Conference on Aging; to amend the Native Americans Programs Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995; and for other purposes; with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–3017. A communication from the Chairman of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the FCA's 1992 salary range structures, performance-based merit pay matrix, and a description of recently adopted compensation policies and practices; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

EC–3018. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on budget recissions and deferrals dated April 8, 1992; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–3019. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on one proposed rescission of budget authority, one new deferral, and revised amounts of one deferral previously reported; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–3020. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Acquisition), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Air Force intentions to conduct a cost comparison of Air Training Command's Base Operating Support function at Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3021. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, the annual report on United States Costs in the Persian Gulf Conflict and Foreign Contributions to Offset Such Costs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3022. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for military functions of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3023. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on progress on HUD's Program Monitoring and Evaluation Initiative; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–3024. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt distinctive counterfeit deterrents for exclusive use in the manufacture of United States securities and obligations, to clarify existing authority to combat counterfeiting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–3025. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Final Evaluation of the Neighborhood Development Demonstration Program"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–3026. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "State and Local Pension Fund Financing of Housing"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–3027. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–3028. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a transaction involving United States exports to Venezuela; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–3029. A communication from the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on implementation of the Community Reinvestment Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–3030. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the continued improvement and expansion of the Nation's airports and airways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–3031. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of Commerce International Trade Administration's management of its Foreign Service Personnel System; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–3032. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Production and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of Defense Metric Transition Plan for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–3033. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the results of the Port Needs Study; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–3034. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to eliminate economic regulation of motor carriers and interstate water carriers, to sunset the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–3035. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to clarify inspection and enforcement authority over foreign passenger vessels and align inspection authority with the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–3036. A communication from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–3037. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–3038. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the findings and recommendations of the North Carolina Environmental Sciences Review Panel; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3039. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3040. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3041. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3042. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3043. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director of the National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the United

States Continental Scientific Drilling Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3044. A communication from the Executive Director of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3045. A communication from the Chairman of the Inland Waterways Users Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the activities of the Board during the past year and its recommendations with respect to construction and rehabilitation priorities on the inland waterways of the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3046. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a proposed environmental restoration project for Kissimmee River, Florida; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3047. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on abnormal occurrences at licensed nuclear facilities for the fourth calendar quarter of 1991; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3048. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the termination of the application of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Hungary; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3049. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report entitled the "Massachusetts UI Self-Employment Demonstration"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3050. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on Soviet Noncompliance with Arms Control Agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3051. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements other than treaties, entered into in the sixty day period prior to April 9, 1992; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3052. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3401 (a) of title 39, United States Code, to permit essential civilians supporting military operations, in an area overseas designated by the President, to mail at no cost letters or recorded communications of a personal nature; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3053. A communication from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the claim of Mr. Terrill W. Ramsey to be reimbursed full relocation expenses; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3054. A communication from Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation entitled "Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for FY 1991"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3055. A communication from the Secretary of the United States Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3056. A communication from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the Commission's compliance with the requirements of the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3057. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a financial management status and government-wide 5-year financial management plan; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3058. A communication from the Director of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Feasibility of Expanded Use of Section 8 Vouchers by Indian Housing Authorities"; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–3059. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report of the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System covering the implementation of its administrative responsibilities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1991; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3060. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Notice of Final Funding Priorities—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research for calendar years 1992–1993"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–3061. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Final Regulations—Educational Partnerships Program"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–3062. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Effectiveness of State Programs and Technical Assistance; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–3063. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to ratify the Department of Veterans' Affairs' interpretation of the provisions of section 1151 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3064. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Chief Medical Director or designee regarding review of the performance of probationary title 38 health care employees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3065. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify certain eligibility requirements for veterans' readjustment appointments in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ADAMS:

S. 2623. A bill to authorize the release of restrictions and a reversionary interest in certain lands in Clallam County, Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GLENN (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. GORE, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2624. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Interagency Council on the Homeless, the Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 2625. A bill to designate the United States courthouse being constructed at 400 Cooper Street in Camden, New Jersey, as the "Mitchell H. Cohen United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANSTON (by request):

S. 2626. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase, effective as of December 1, 1992, the rates of and limitations on disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain disabled veterans; and to lengthen the period of wartime service required to qualify for improved pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COATS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PELL, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. SASSER):

S.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 18, 1992 as "National Radon Action Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution authorizing the 1992 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ADAMS:

S. 2623. A bill to authorize the release of restrictions and a reversionary interest in certain lands in Clallam County, WA; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PORT ANGELES MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

• Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to introduce legislation that will provide long-term benefits for the Port Angeles Memorial Hospital in Port Angeles, WA.

In 1941, officials established a land grant for the Memorial Hospital in Port Angeles, WA. Included in this grant was a reversionary clause that reverted the land back to the Federal Treasury if the land was not used for

the hospital. While at the time this seemed a logical stipulation, it has proven now to have bound the hospital to an impractical situation.

My bill would release the land from the reversionary clause. It would allow the hospital to sell the land it sits on and use the proceeds to relocate or expand the hospital. If the proceeds do not go toward the hospital, it would be paid to the Federal Treasury. This flexibility will allow the hospital to plan for the future. It will ensure that the hospital will be able to use the land for its long-term plans to best serve the people of Port Angeles and Clallam County.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2623

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO RELEASE REVERSIONARY INTEREST.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—If the entity to whom the United States patented the lands described in subsection (b) enters into an agreement as specified in subsection (c), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to release the restrictions contained in patent numbered 1123694, concerning the lands described in subsection (b), and to relinquish the reversionary interest of the United States in such lands.

(b) LANDS DESCRIBED.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) are those lands, amounting to approximately 7.64 acres in Clallam County, Washington, conveyed by the patent referred to in subsection (a) to the Public Hospital District Numbered 2 (Hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Hospital District").

(c) AGREEMENT.—The agreement referred to in subsection (a) is an agreement which provides that the Hospital District agrees—

(1) to determine, through appraisal, the fair market value of the lands; and

(2)(A) that after such release and relinquishment, the Hospital District will sell such property for not less than fair market value; and

(B) either to apply all the proceeds of such sale to the construction and operation of a new hospital facility meeting all applicable requirements of law or to pay all such proceeds to the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States.●

By Mr. GLENN (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. GORE, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2624. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Interagency Council on the Homeless, the Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REAUTHORIZATION OF INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS AND THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, the legislation I am introducing today would reauthorize the Emergency Food and Shelter National Board Program and the Interagency Council on the Homeless, both of which were created under the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, and both of which are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, which I chair. This bill would reauthorize the Emergency Food and Shelter National Board Program funding level at $180 million for the first year and $200 million for the second year. In addition, it would fund the Interagency Council on the Homeless at an authorization level of $1.5 million and $1.7 million in each of the next 2 years, respectively.

The first of these programs, the Emergency Food and Shelter National Board Program, is chaired by the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] and includes representatives of various national nonprofits. The National Board Program is intended to aid nonprofit organizations in thousands of counties around the country to purchase food, supply shelter, and to supplement and extend current available resources in order to meet emergency needs of homeless and hungry people. As chairman of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, I well know the importance of this program. The National Board brings Federal agencies, State entities, and local nonprofit groups together in a unique and highly successful effort to assist those most in need. This program's funds are distributed on a formula basis, straight to emergency shelters, soup kitchens, and other nonprofit groups in every State. And, unlike what happens in most programs, a negligible percentage of the National Board's funds are spent on administrative costs. Each nonprofit organization raises almost all of its own funds for administration.

For fiscal year 1993, the administration has requested $100 million for the Emergency Food and Shelter National Board program, which is $34 million below the program's appropriation in 1991. The administration explains its request below this level as "a shift of resources away from emergency programs towards programs that provide longer-term and more comprehensive approaches to the problems faced by the homeless." Mr. President, I agree that we need to develop longer term solutions which will help the homeless out of their plight. That is why I am proposing an increase in this and the Council's funding levels, so that we might buttress and improve current approaches that look like they ultimately will work in the long term. But what about those who have just lost their jobs and their homes? What about those who stand on the brink of homelessness? Must they wait until they become homeless before they receive any help?

The simple fact is that not only do these programs actually address longer term concerns, they also are a necessity in facing the national emergency of homelessness now, an emergency which not only persists but has grown. In a 28-city survey, the U.S. Conference of Mayors found that as of December 1991, requests for emergency food assistance have increased by 26 percent. Requests for emergency shelter have grown by 17 percent over the year before. Since that survey, the recession has only worsened. Many States, including my own State of Ohio, have cut their general assistance programs. Thousands in Ohio will lose benefits, in many cases, their only benefits, at the beginning of April. I have had it reported to me that some people in Ohio have stated that they are going to take their last benefit check and buy a gun with it. Such, Mr. President, is the level of frustration and desperation on the streets of our cities in these times. Providers are crying out for our help. Members of the National Board have told my staff that even if this program's funding were tripled, it still would not be enough to meet the need. Perhaps this administration can simply dismiss the real emergency in our midst—we simply cannot afford to look the other way.

The second program my bill reauthorizes, the Interagency Council on the Homeless, was established to coordinate Federal homeless programs and provide information about these programs and homelessness generally on a national level. The Council brings together all Federal agencies to coordinate and direct Federal homelessness efforts, in addition to providing support to State, local, and private programs. Since its inception, the Council has made great improvements in its operations. Many local providers in my home State of Ohio have expressed praise for its programs and workshops.

Mr. President, my bill proposes modest increases in both of these very valuable programs. At a time when people are facing crises unimagined in their own lives and when the very services we have provided so far are, in some cases, the only hope they see for survival, we cannot and must not turn our backs and do nothing. Increased funding for these programs admits and attempts to address the desperate realities of this recession, while at the same time supporting some well-begun efforts to find long-term solutions to the daunting and persistent problems of chronic homelessness. I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring and passing this vital legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2624

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS

SECTION 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 208 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11318) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC 208. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1993, and $1,700,000 for fiscal year 1994.".

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF INTERAGENCY COUNCIL.

Section 209 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11319) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1992" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1994".

TITLE II—FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM.

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 322 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11352) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 322. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $180,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, and $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1994.".●

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 2625. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse being constructed at 400 Cooper Street in Camden, NJ, as the "Mitchell H. Cohen United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MITCHELL H. COHEN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to designate the U.S. courthouse under construction at 400 Cooper Street, Camden, NJ, as the Mitchell H. Cohen United States Courthouse.

Mitchell Cohen dedicated over 50 years of his life to public service. He was born in Philadelphia, PA, in 1904 and later moved to New Jersey. From 1922 to 1924, Judge Cohen attended Temple University. He received his law degree in 1928 from Dickinson Law School in Pennsylvania.

Judge Cohen began his career as a solicitor for the Camden City Welfare Board in 1936. Over the years, his experience as a public servant varied greatly, serving as Camden city prosecutor, Camden city freeholder, special deputy attorney general, and serving as judge of New Jersey Superior Court. In 1962, President John F. Kennedy appointed him to the U.S. district court for the District of New Jersey. Judge Cohen became chief judge in 1973. Judge Cohen was also assigned temporarily to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in Philadelphia, PA.

Beyond his various judicial positions, Judge Cohen was appointed to serve on the character and fitness committee for the Camden County Bar Association. Despite his heavy workload, Judge Cohen still found time to be active in several philanthropic organizations, including serving as chairman of the Allied Jewish Appeal, as a member of the board of directors of the Federation of Jewish Charities, as member of the board of trustees for the Child Care Center and as Camden County Chairman of the Sister Kenny Foundation. Judge Cohen was also a member of the American Bar Association, the New Jersey State Bar Association, the Camden County Bar Association, the American Judicature Society, the American Legion, and Jewish War Veterans.

Mr. President, Judge Mitchell Cohen passed away on January 7, 1991, and is greatly missed. He dedicated most of his life to public office, community service, and charitable organizations. It would be most fitting for the new courthouse to be named after an individual who dedicated his entire career to the pursuit of justice for all Americans. Mitchell H. Cohen was a man of noble character who distinguished himself to his colleagues, community, and many organizations. He is worthy of such a tribute.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2625

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse under construction at 400 Cooper Street in Camden, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Mitchell H. Cohen United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Mitchell H. Cohen United States Courthouse".●

By Mr. CRANSTON (by request):

S. 2626. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase, effective as of December 1, 1992, the rates of limitations on disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain disabled veterans; and to lengthen the period of wartime service required to qualify for improved pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

VETERANS COMPENSATION RATES AND PENSION ELIGIBILITY REFORM ACT OF 1992

● Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have today introduced, by request, S. 2626, the proposed Veterans' Compensation Rates and Pension Eligibility Reform Act of 1992. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs transmitted this legislation by letter dated March 27, 1992, to the President of the Senate.

My introduction of this measure is in keeping with the policy which I have adopted of generally introducing—so that there will be specific bills to which my colleagues and others may direct their attention and comments—all administration-proposed draft legislation referred to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Thus, I reserve the right to support or oppose the provisions of, as well as any amendment to, this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the transmittal letter and enclosure.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2626

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Rates and Pension Eligibility Reform Act of 1992."

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

TITLE I—DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION RATE INCREASES

SEC. 101. INCREASE IN RATES AND LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, as provided in paragraph (2), increase, effective December 1, 1992, the rates of and limitations on Department of Veterans Affairs disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation.

(2)(A) The Secretary shall increase each of the rates and limitations in sections 1114, 1115(1), 1162, 1311, 1313, and 1314 of title 38, United States Code, that were increased by the amendments made by the Veterans' Compensation Rate Amendments of 1991 (Public Law No. 102-152). This increase shall be made in such rates and limitations as in effect on November 30, 1992, and shall be by the same percentage that benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) will be increased effective January 1, 1993, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(B) In the computation of increased rates and limitations pursuant to subparagraph (A), amounts of any fraction of a dollar shall be rounded to the nearest dollar amount.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857, 72 Stat. 1263 (1958), who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 102. PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT.

At the same time as the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D), are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 1992, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the rates and limitations referred to in subsection (a)(2)(A) as increased under this section.

TITLE II—WARTIME SERVICE REQUIREMENT FOR PENSION

SEC. 201. (a) Section 1521(j) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"A veteran meets the service requirements of this section if such veteran served in the active military, naval, or air service—

"(1) for one hundred eighty days or more during a period of war;

"(2) during a period of war and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability; or

"(3) for an aggregate of one hundred eighty days or more in two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only to veterans who first enter active military service after the date prescribed by Presidential proclamation or by law as the ending date of the Persian Gulf war.

(c) In the case of a claim filed by a veteran who first entered active military service on or before the ending date of the Persian Gulf War, as prescribed by Presidential proclamation or by law, (including a claim with regard to which eligibility has been finally determined), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall apply section 1521(j) of title 38, United States Code, as it existed on the date prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, March 27, 1992.

Hon. DAN QUAYLE,
President of the Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft bill entitled the "Veterans' Compensation Rates and Pension Eligibility Reform Act of 1992." I request that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for prompt consideration and enactment.

Title I of the draft bill would provide a cost-of-living increase, effective December 1, 1992, in the rates of compensation for service-disabled veterans and of dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) for the survivors of veterans who die as a result of service. Under this proposal, the rate of increase would be the same as the cost-of-living adjustment that will be provided under current law to veterans' pension and Social Security recipients. In computing increased rates, fractions would be rounded to the nearest dollar.

Compensation under title 38, United States Code, is payable only for disabilities resulting from injuries or diseases incurred or aggravated during active service. Payments are based upon a statutory schedule of rates which vary with the degree of disability assigned by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), and additional amounts are payable to veterans with spouses and children if the veteran's disability is rated 30-percent or more disabling. DIC benefits are payable at statutorily directed rates to the surviving spouses or children of veterans who die of service-connected causes, or who die of other causes if they suffered service-connected total disability for prescribed periods immediately preceding their deaths. This proposed cost-of-living increase will serve as a hedge against inflation for these most deserving beneficiaries.

Based on a contemplated increase of 3.0 percent, enactment of this legislation would result in estimated additional costs of $313 million in fiscal year 1993 and $1.8 billion over the five-year period fiscal year 1993 through fiscal year 1997.

Title II of the draft bill would amend section 1521(j) of title 38, United States Code, to require generally 180 days of service during wartime in order to qualify for improved pension. This amendment would be effective only as to veterans who first enter active service after the end of the Persian Gulf War. In order to meet the service requirements for pension under current law, a veteran at minimum must generally have served ninety consecutive days at least one day of which must have been during a period of war. This amendment would ensure that, in the future, pension benefits are better targeted to those veterans who had more significant periods of wartime service. No costs or savings are anticipated for fiscal years 1993 through 1997 as a result of enactment of this legislation.

The effect of this draft bill on the deficit is:

FISCAL YEARS
[In millions of dollars]

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1992–97
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

Section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, requires that the baseline for veterans' compensation assume a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) equal to the veterans' pension program COLA. We currently estimate a 3.0 percent COLA for veterans' pensions. The COLA increase in this draft bill is also 3.0 percent. Since this draft bill implements the policy assumed in the baseline, the Office of Management and Budget scores zero pay-as-you-go costs for this draft bill.

We urge that the House promptly consider and pass these two legislative items. In addition, we urge the House to promptly consider and pass certain legislation introduced or proposed by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) during the first session of the 102d Congress. These legislative items are described in the enclosure to this letter.

We have been advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the submission of the draft bill to Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI.

THE VETERANS' BENEFITS REFORM ACT OF 1991

RENOUNCEMENT OF RIGHTS TO BENEFITS

On July 2, 1991, we recommend legislation to amend what is now 38 U.S.C. §5306 to provide that when a new claim for an income-based benefit is filed within a year of a renouncement of the benefit, benefits will be payable as if the renouncement had not occurred. This proposal was introduced in the Senate on July 22, 1991, as Title III of S. 1516, 102d Congress, the "Veterans' Benefits Reform Act of 1991."

Under current law, a claimant has the right to renounce pension, compensation, or DIC and, following such renouncement, has the right to file a new application for the benefit, which application is treated as an original application. Under current law, a claimant receiving a need-based benefit, i.e., pension or parents' DIC, may renounce the benefit in anticipation of receipt of nonrecurring income and then, following the receipt of such income, reapply for pension benefits. Such a claimant, who renounces the benefit and then reapplies within a year of the renouncement, can effectively avoid having the income received during the interval between the renouncement and the new application considered for income-computation purposes. Existence of this "loophole" is inconsistent with the objective of the improved-pension program that benefits be provided on the basis of actual need.

Title III of S. 1516 would eliminate this "loophole" in section 5306 by providing that a new application for pension or parents' DIC filed within one year after a renouncement shall not be treated as an original application and that benefits will be payable as if the renouncement had not occurred. This will ensure that income received during the interval between the renouncement and the filing of the new application will be considered for income-computation purposes.

Enactment of this legislation would result in estimated pay-as-you-go savings of $50 thousand in fiscal year 1993 and $1.45 million for fiscal years 1993 through 1997. These savings are incorporated in the President's fiscal year 1993 Budget.

COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING BENEFITS

On July 2, 1991, we also recommended legislation to authorize VA to suspend benefit payments if the payee fails to keep VA informed of the payee's current mailing address or cooperate in the establishment of another method of communication concerning benefits. This proposal was introduced in the Senate on July 22, 1991, as Title IV of S. 1516.

Section 5120(f) of title 38, United States Code, provides that, if a payee does not have a mailing address, payments will be delivered under methods prescribed by VA. This provision addresses the problems that the lack of a mailing address causes recipients in receiving their benefits. However, an amendment is necessary to address the problems that the lack of a mailing address causes VA in fulfilling its responsibilities to assure that veterans' benefits are provided in accordance with law. In the absence of a current mailing address or other arrangements, VA cannot contact beneficiaries in order to provide notice or information about benefits, request verification of continued entitlement, and investigate possible fraud.

Title IV of S. 1516 would amend what is now 38 U.S.C. §5120(f) to authorize the Secretary to prescribe an appropriate method or methods for communicating with beneficiaries and would authorize suspension of payments to payees who fail or refuse to provide the Secretary with a current mailing address or cooperate in establishing another appropriate method of communication for provision of notices concerning benefits and verification of continued eligibility. The regulations would ensure that payments will be resumed promptly once a current mailing address or other appropriate means of communication with the payee is established. The amendment will assist VA in obtaining evidence in support of claims while reducing fraud, waste, and abuse. VA believes that it is not unreasonable to require that recipients of VA benefits make themselves available to provide information and to receive notices concerning benefits provided to them. VA estimates that there are no administrative or benefit costs associated with this proposal.

CONFORMING TIME LIMIT ON SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE

On July 2, 1991, we further recommended legislation to amend what is now section 5110(h) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that when an award of pension has been deferred or paid based on anticipated income, the effective date of entitlement or increase in pension shall be in accordance with the facts found if evidence is received before the expiration of the next year. This proposal was introduced in the Senate on July 22, 1991, as section 303 of S. 1518, 102d Congress, the "Veterans' and Survivors' Com-

pensation and Pension Improvement Act of 1991."

Under current law, pensioners have until the expiration of the next calendar year to submit such evidence, resulting in wide variations in limitation periods under the improved pension program, which, unlike previous pension programs, does not operate on a calendar-year basis. For example, a pensioner with a reporting period which happens to begin January 1 would have until December 31 of the following year to revise the income report, some 24 months, while a pensioner with a reporting period which begins December 1, who would also have until December 31 of the following year, a period of only 13 months. VA believes that such inequities and inconsistencies, which the improved pension program was intended to avoid, should be eliminated. VA estimates that there are no administrative or benefit costs associated with this proposal.

MANILA REGIONAL OFFICE

VA also urges passage of legislation to extend VA's authority to maintain and operate a regional office in the Republic of the Philippines. This authority expired September 30, 1991. Section 501 of H.R. 2280, 102d Congress, the "Veterans' Programs Amendments of 1991," would amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to extend this authority through March 31, 1994. Title VI of S. 1518 would extend this authority through September 30, 1996.

VA administers programs providing compensation, pension, and education benefits through a regional office in Manila to Filipinos who were in or attached to the United States Armed Forces during World War II. During fiscal year 1989, more than $123 million in benefits were paid through the Manila regional office. Operating a regional office in the Philippines is the most cost-effective means of administering VA programs for Filipino beneficiaries.

DEFINITION OF MINOR CHILD

Finally, VA urges passage of section 701(a) of S. 127, 102d Congress, the "Veterans Benefits and Health Care Amendments of 1991," which would clarify the eligibility of veterans' children for burial in our national cemeteries. Pursuant to 38 U.S.C. §2402, the minor children of veterans and certain others are eligible for national-cemetery burial. However, the term "minor child" is not further defined in the statute.

When Congress enacted the National Cemeteries Act of 1973, transferring from the Department of Army to VA the responsibility for operating national cemeteries, it reenacted without change the prior title 24 provisions regarding eligibility. The Department of Army, in exercising its authority, had interpreted the provision in title 24 referring to "minor child" to include children under age 21. Because Congress indicated an intent that similar eligibility rules should apply under VA's stewardship of the cemetery system, this Department employs in its regulation, 38 C.F.R. §1.620(g), the same definition as that previously used by the Army, but with one exception. Our regulation includes as minor children those who are under age 23, if they are attending approved educational institutions. This is in keeping with the general definition of "child" for title 38 purposes.

Codification of this definition, as contemplated in section 701(a) of S. 127, would avoid confusion regarding eligibility of minor children. The definition of "child" found at 38 U.S.C. §101(4) is in one significant respect more restrictive than our definition of "minor child" for purposes of burial eligibility. Under section 101(4), an individual is generally not considered to be a "child" after reaching age 18 unless, as indicated above, the individual is pursuing an education (in which case age 23 is the upper limit). We do not believe Congress intended to so limit burial eligibility. VA estimates that there are no administrative or benefit costs associated with this proposal.●

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COATS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PELL, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. SASSER):

S.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 18, 1992, through October 24, 1992 as "National Radon Action Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL RADON ACTION WEEK

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, Senator WARNER and 19 other Senators are joining me today in introducing a Senate joint resolution which would designate the week of October 18, 1992, as "National Radon Action Week."

Radon exposure poses a serious health risk to the people of our Nation. The EPA estimates that the number of deaths per year due to radon exposure is approximately 14,000. Fortunately, elevated radon levels can be reduced successfully at relatively low cost.

Testing in homes and schools and educating people about the risks associated with radon exposure are the first steps we can take to protect ourselves and our children from the harmful effects of radon. Our resolution calls for the establishment of a National Radon Action Week to encourage these activities.

Last year, the Congress approved Senate Joint Resolution 132 to establish National Radon Action Week in 1991. The resolution, which was signed by President Bush, resulted in a wide range of activities sponsored by EPA and other organizations to encourage radon testing and remediation. These included a weekly reader supplement to over 3 million students, the distribution of an American Medical Association radon brochure to several hundred thousand physicians, public service announcements, outreach to over 2,000 grocery stores, radon awareness messages on NFL scoreboards displaying the radon hotline phone number, and stories in the media about radon.

This resolution has been endorsed by a broad range of groups and associations including the American Lung Association, the American Cancer Society, the National Congress of Parent-Teachers Associations, the National Education Association, the Consumer Federation of America, and the State and Territorial Air Pollution Control Administrators.

I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 294

Whereas exposure to radon poses a serious threat to the health of the people of this Nation;

Whereas the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that lung cancer attributable to radon exposure causes approximately 20,000 deaths a year in the United States;

Whereas the United States has set a long-term national goal of making the air inside buildings as free of radon as the ambient air;

Whereas excessively high levels of radon in homes and schools can be reduced successfully and economically with appropriate treatment;

Whereas only about 2 percent of the homes in this Nation have been tested for radon levels;

Whereas the people of this Nation should be educated about the dangers of exposure to radon; and

Whereas people should be encouraged to conduct tests for radon in their homes and schools and to make the repairs required to reduce excessive radon levels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of October 18, 1992, through October 24, 1992, is designated as "National Radon Action Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 130

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 130, a bill to amend the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act to prescribe that no State may allow a low-level radioactive waste facility to be constructed within 50 miles of another State's border without the approval of that State's legislature.

S. 240

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] were added as cosponsors of S. 240, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to bankruptcy transportation plans.

S. 551

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 551, a bill to encourage States to establish Parents as Teachers programs.

S. 847

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 847, a bill to limit spending in-

creases for fiscal years 1992 through 1995 to 4 percent.

S. 1013

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1013, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the earned income tax credit for individuals with young children.

S. 1100

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1100, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide grants to urban and rural communities for training economically disadvantaged youth in education and employment skills and to expand the supply of housing for homeless and economically disadvantaged individuals and families.

S. 1130

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1130, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for rollover of gain from sale of farm assets into an individual retirement account.

S. 1198

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1198, a bill to provide that the compensation paid to certain corporate officers shall be treated as a proper subject for action by security holders, to require certain disclosures regarding such compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to amend chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive military retired pay concurrently with disability compensation.

S. 1423

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] were added as cosponsors of S. 1423, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to limited partnership rollups.

S. 1622

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1622, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to improve the provisions of such act with respect to the health and safety of employees, and for other purposes.

S. 1704

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] were added as cosponsors of S. 1704, a bill to improve the administration and management of public lands, National Forests, units of the National Park System, and related areas by improving the availability of adequate, appropriate, affordable, and cost effective housing for employees needed to effectively manage the public lands.

S. 1729

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1729, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require drug manufacturers to provide affordable prices for drugs purchased by certain entities funded under the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1731

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1731, a bill to establish the policy of the United States with respect to Hong Kong after July 1, 1997, and for other purposes.

S. 1786

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1786, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the White House.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. WOFFORD, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1830, a bill to require Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to pay for medical services provided by the Office of the Attending Physician, and for other purposes.

S. 1838

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1838, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a limitation on use of claim sampling to deny claims or recover overpayments under Medicare.

S. 1866

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1866, a bill to promote community based economic development and to provide assistance for community development corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1962

At the request of Mr. ADAMS, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1962, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to apply the act to certain workers, and for other purposes.

S. 1996

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1996, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for uniform coverage of anticancer drugs under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2089

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2089, a bill to repeal exemptions from civil rights and labor laws for Members of Congress.

S. 2093

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2093, a bill to insure that any peace dividend is invested in America's families and deficit reduction.

S. 2109

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] were added as cosponsors of S. 2109, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit certain entities to elect taxable years other than taxable years required by the Tax Reform Act of 1986, and for other purposes.

S. 2116

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2116, a bill to improve the health of children by increasing access to childhood immunizations, and for other purposes.

S. 2160

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2160, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to elect a deduction or credit for interest on certain educational loans.

S. 2244

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2244, a bill to require the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate U.S. participation in that conflict.

S. 2277

At the request of Mr. COHEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 2277, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate the entering into of cooperative agreements between hospitals for the purpose of enabling such hospitals to share expensive medical or high technology equipment or services, and for other purposes.

S. 2319

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2319, a bill to require analysis and estimates of the likely impact of Federal legislation and regulations upon the private sector and State and local governments, and for other purposes.

S. 2327

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] were added as cosponsors of S. 2327, a bill to suspend certain compliance and accountability measures under the National School Lunch Act.

S. 2328

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] were added as cosponsors of S. 2328, a bill to provide that for taxable years beginning before 1980 the Federal income tax deductibility of flight training expenses shall be determined without regard to whether such expenses were reimbursed through certain veterans educational assistance allowances.

S. 2384

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2384, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require the owner or operator of a solid waste disposal facility to obtain authorization from the affected local government before accepting waste generated outside of the State, and for other purposes.

S. 2409

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2409, a bill to amend the provisions of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 with respect to the enforcement of machine tool import arrangements.

S. 2411

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] were added as cosponsors of S. 2411, a bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992.

S. 2509

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 2509, a bill to provide grants to establish an integrated approach to prevent child abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2517

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2517, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to rename the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency as the National Advanced Research Projects Agency, to expand the mission of that agency, and for other purposes.

S. 2531

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2531, a bill to establish a Commission on Project Government Reform.

S. 2537

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] were added as cosponsors of S. 2537, a bill to support efforts to promote democracy in Peru.

S. 2538

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2538, a bill to establish a comprehensive program to ensure the safety of fish products intended for human consumption and sold in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 2540

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2540, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the establishment of individual medical savings accounts to assist in the payment of medical and long-term care expenses and other qualified expenses, to provide that the earnings on such accounts will not be taxable, and for other purposes.

S. 2554

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2554, a bill to expand the technology extension activities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology in support of technical skills enhancement.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 18

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 18, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to a federal balanced budget.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 35

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 35, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to contributions and expenditures intended to affect Congressional and Presidential elections.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 166

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 166, a joint resolution designating the week of October 6 through 12, 1991, as "National Customer Service Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 182

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 182, a joint resolution proposing a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 247

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 247, a joint resolution designating June 11, 1992, as "National Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 248

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 248, a joint resolution designating August 7, 1992, as "Battle of Guadalcanal Remembrance Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 252

At the request of Mr. DIXON, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 252, a joint resolution designating the week of April 19–25, 1992, as "National Credit Education Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 258

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 258, a joint resolution designating the week commencing May 3, 1992, as "National Correctional Officers Week."

59-059 O—96 Vol. 138 (Pt. 7) 28

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 263

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 263, a joint resolution to designate May 4, 1992, through May 10, 1992, as "Public Service Recognition Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 266

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 266, a joint resolution designating the week of April 26–May 2, 1992, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 277

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 277, a joint resolution to designate May 13, 1992, as "Irish Brigade Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 280

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 280, a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April, 1992, as "National Arbor Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 289

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 289, a joint resolution designating the period beginning April 9, 1992, and ending May 6, 1992, as "Bataan-Corregidor Month."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain regulations of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 97

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 97, a concurrent resolution to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Battle of Midway.

SENATE RESOLUTION 66

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 66, a resolution to amend the rules of the Senate to improve legislative efficiency, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 111—AUTHORIZING THE 1992 SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY TO BE RUN THROUGH THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. D'AMATO submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 111

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF RUNNING OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS.

On May 15, 1992, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may designate jointly, the 1992 Special Olympics Torch Relay may be run through the Capitol Grounds, as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics spring games at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary to carry out section 1.

SEC. 3. CONDITION RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event authorized by section 1.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet at 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 6, 1992, in SR–301, to hold a hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 221 and 275, providing for the appointments of Hanna Holborn Gray and Wesley Samuel Williams, Jr., respectively, as citizen regents of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Witnesses scheduled to testify are Secretary of the Smithsonian Robert McC. Adams, Dr. Gray, and Mr. Williams.

For further information regarding this hearing, please contact Carole Blessington of the Rules Committee staff on 224–0278.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Thursday, May 7, 1992, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony from Linda Stuntz, nominee to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy.

For further information, please contact Rebecca Murphy at (202) 224–7562.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for my colleagues and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

A hearing will take place on Thursday, May 14, 1992 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, First and C Streets, NE., Washington, DC. The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 2607, a bill to authorize regional integrated resource planning by registered holding companies and State regulatory commissions.

Because of the limited time available for the hearings, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the printed hearing record should send their comments to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Attention: Bill Conway.

For further information, please contact Bill Conway of the committee staff at 202/224–7149.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for my colleagues and the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The purpose of the oversight hearing is to receive testimony on the Department of Energy's program for environmental restoration and waste management.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, May 21 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, First and C Streets, NE., Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the printed hearing record should send their comments to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Attention: Mary Louise Wagner.

For further information, please contact Mary Louise Wagner of the committee staff at 202/224–7569.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Small

Business Committee will hold a full committee hearing to consider the President's nomination of Thomas Kerester to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy for the Small Business Administration. The hearing will take place on Tuesday, May 5, 1992, at 9:30 a.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. For further information, please call Patricia Forbes, Counsel, Small Business Committee at 224-5175.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, MONOPOLIES AND BUSINESS RIGHTS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Monopolies, and Business Rights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 28, 1992, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on "Life/Health Guaranty Funds: Can They Live Up to Expectations?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUPPORT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Readiness, Sustainability and Support of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 28, 1992, at 10 a.m., in open session, to receive an overview of Department of Defense operations and maintenance programs in review of the amended Defense authorization request for fiscal year 1993.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 28, 1992, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on simplifying the tax treatment of intangible assets acquired in business purchases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES AND NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to met on Tuesday, April 28, 1992, at 2:30 p.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the onsite inspection agency [OSIA] in review of the amended Defense authorization request for fiscal year 1993 and the future years Defense plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 28, 1992, at 10 a.m., for a hearing on Oversight of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CHRISTOPHER IANNELLA

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute today to one of the most venerable elected officials ever to serve the city of Boston. Christopher A. Iannella has spent 40 years of his life in public service, first as a State representative from Boston and then on its city council. He is presently serving his eighth term as president of that body, establishing a Boston record.

Chris is a living example of enthusiasm, vigor, and vibrancy which immigrants have always brought to this country. Born in San Sossio Baronie, Province of Avellino, Italy, he emigrated to the United States at the age of 8. He was educated in the Boston public schools, Boston English High School, Boston College, and Harvard Law School, and was one of the first Italian-Americans to graduate from that institution.

He lost his first election for State representative in 1948 by three votes, but he learned from that experience, and in 1950, he was elected by an overwhelming margin. Having worked as a fruit peddler in Boston's famous Haymarket Square, as a State representative he initiated legislation creating the Haymarket District, a unique and vibrant open-air market of pushcarts and stalls. Chris is not afraid of controversy, and one of the accomplishments of which he is proud is his authorship, while he was a member of the Boston City Council, of the city of Boston Residency Law. He created the Code Enforcement Division of the city which enforces city environmental codes, and he wrote the Urban Homestead Act, enabling residents to purchase abandoned property from the city for 1 dollar in order to rehabilitate the property for housing and other productive uses.

In this day when many politicians are held in very low esteem, Chris is one who has the people's admiration and respect. "Such a gentleman," they say of him, "Such class!" Senior citizens are especially appreciative of his work on their behalf, and everyone who calls upon him unfailingly is treated with the utmost respect and courtesy. Is it any wonder that when he tells his volunteers, "You're not just a volunteer—you're my friend," that they redouble their efforts on his behalf?

Chris Iannella has served his neighborhood, his city, his Commonwealth, and his adopted country well. I am proud to honor his 40 years in public life.•

WISCONSIN SPECIAL OLYMPICS

• Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to a truly special event that will take place in Wisconsin on June 4, 5, and 6—the Wisconsin Special Olympics summer games in Stevens Point, WI.

This event is a terrific opportunity for disabled Wisconsinites to compete, to excel—and to have fun. And it reminds the members of the community who don't have disabilities that disabled people have the same hopes, dreams and joys as the rest of us.

The Wisconsin Special Olympics are a valuable reminder that we need to do more to bring down the social and economic barriers to disabled people. I ask all my colleagues to join me in extending our thanks to organizers Cheri A. Karch, Julie Greycarek, and Sara Brandl-Reaves—and our warmest best wishes for a successful event.•

S. 2116, THE COMPREHENSIVE CHILD HEALTH IMMUNIZATION ACT

• Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor legislation introduced by the senior Senator from Michigan in November, S. 2116, the Comprehensive Child Health Immunization Act.

This bill, which codifies a number of important recommendations made by the National Vaccine Advisory Council, is very important and proposes a truly comprehensive strategy to deal with the serious problem we face. Nationwide, it is estimated that two-thirds of U.S. 2-year-olds are not immunized against such deadly and sadly preventable diseases as measles, mumps, rubella, and polio. In Louisiana, the Office of Public Health estimates that statewide between 30 and 40 percent of our 2-year-olds do not have up-to-date vaccinations and are at risk. In New Orleans, however, only 40 percent of the city's 2-year-olds are up to date leaving 60 percent of the city's young children at risk.

We have made progress, Mr. President, in large part because of the almost doubling in funding for immunization programs between 1989 and 1992. I am pleased to note that this year's budget request contains an 18-percent, $52 million increase for immunization programs which will help continue this trend.

But we can and should do more. According to the Children's Defense Fund, 16 nations had better immunization rates for 1-year-olds fully immunized against polio than the United States in the latest reported year [1988]. For nonwhite babies, 55 countries were

doing a better job, inciuding developing nations like Albania, Botswana, and Sri Lanka. And although measles eradication seemed attainable in the late 1970's, and we reached an all time low in numbers of reported measles cases in 1983, in 1988 we faced an epidemic as immunizations declined, and reached 25,000 cases in 1990, most of which were among pre-school age children and could have been prevented had timely immunizations occurred.

This bill will enable us to do more with existing resources. Increasing outreach efforts, redoubling information dissemination efforts, and helping establish a nationwide registry to provide for comprehensive tracking of our children's immunization status are very important to helping us improve our record. In addition, the incremental financial assistance authorized in this bill is critical if we are to improve our record. Many private insurance plans in Louisiana do not cover routine immunizations which can cost up to $100 per visit. Although the Office of Public Health offers this service, because of limited staff and facilities they can only reach about 70 percent of Louisiana's children, and are hard-pressed to maintain the level of services they currently provide. Hopefully, the technical and financial assistance authorized by this bill will enable them to do more for those kids who are now at risk.●

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS UNDER RULE 35, PARAGRAPH 4, PERMITTING ACCEPTANCE OF A GIFT OF EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL FROM A FOREIGN ORGANIZATION

● Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principle objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee received a request for a determination under rule 35 for Senator MCCONNELL and Brian Riendeau, a member of Senator MCCONNELL's staff, to participate in a program in Jakarta, Taipei, and Hong Kong, sponsored by the Republicans Abroad, a domestic organization, the Chinese National Association of Industry and Commerce, a private foreign organization, and the U.S. Government from April 18-24, 1992.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator MCCONNELL and Mr. Riendeau in this program, at the expense of the Republicans Abroad, the Chinese National Association of Industry and Commerce, and the United States Government is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee received a request for a determination under rule 35 for Brian Riendeau, a member of the staff of Senator MCCONNELL, to participate in a program in Hong Kong, sponsored by the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce, from April 12-18, 1992.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Riendeau in this program, at the expense of the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.●

JOHN W. CASEY TO LEAD WORLD ALLIANCE OF YMCAS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to make my colleagues aware of the outstanding accomplishment of John W. Casey of La Grange, IL, who was recently elected Secretary General of the World Alliance of YMCAs. I am pleased that he is the first American in 35 years to fill this important position.

Since 1982, Mr. Casey has served as president of the Chicago chapter of the YMCA. He has done a marvelous job of refocusing YMCA's efforts to help at-risk youth and expand community development activities by setting up support and service networks.

His challenges ahead at the World Alliance of YMCAs include exercising responsibility for refugee relief service and natural disaster relief. In addition, Mr. Casey will have the opportunity to fulfill his goal of helping improve understanding between people of many diverse cultures.

I am certain that my colleagues join me in commending him for his devotion to public service, thanking him for his invaluable contribution to people of Chicago, and wishing him the best at the World Alliance of YMCAs.

Mr. President, I ask that an Illinois State Senate resolution honoring Mr. Casey appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 974

Whereas, John W. Casey, the President of the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago since 1982, was recently elected to the post of Secretary General of the World Alliance of YMCAs, the first American in 35 years to fill that position; and

Whereas, With nearly 70% of the world organization's local YMCAs located in emerging nations, Mr. Casey will be facing a challenging assignment in which he will be responsible for refugee relief service and natural disaster relief; and

Whereas, As the new Secretary General for the international organization, Mr. Casey will be responsible for uniting national YMCAs around common issues; and

Whereas, As President of the Chicago YMCA chapter since 1982, Mr. Casey has improved the organization's financial picture and refocused the YMCA's efforts on youths at risk, and in addition, he has expanded community development activity by setting up support and service networks to confront issues affecting certain neighborhoods; and

Whereas, John W. Casey, who lives in La Grange with his wife, Patricia, and family, has two business degrees from Loyola; before joining the YMCA as an assistant director of personnel in 1968, he marketed industrial chemicals; and

Whereas, From 1979 to 1982, John Casey served as Executive Director of the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid which provided support services to the bipartisan joint committee of the Illinois General Assembly; and

Whereas, Mr. Casey served in the U.S. Army Reserves from 1960 to 1966, with six months of active duty; and

Whereas, In his new position, John W. Casey will be able to fulfill his goal of helping to develop better understanding between the many cultures and peoples of the world; and

Whereas, Mr. Casey's appointment to this prestigious position reflects well upon his Chicago colleagues and upon the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the Eighty-Seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we congratulate John W. Casey on his election to the post of Secretary General of the World Alliance of YMCAs; that we commend him for his devotion to public service; and that we thank him for the services he has rendered to the Chicago community and the State; and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to John W. Casey.

Adopted by the Senate, January 16, 1992.●

YOUTH AWARENESS DAY

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the efforts of a truly outstanding group of Wisconsin young people—those involved in creating the event known as Youth Awareness Day.

On May 15, the second Youth Awareness Day will be held in Wisconsin Rapids, WI. This is a valuable meeting focusing on drug and alcohol abuse issues—featuring guest speakers who will inform young people about the value of self-esteem and strong personal relationships in preventing drug and alcohol addiction.

This is a terrific message—and what makes this Youth Awareness Day event especially impressive is that it is a student-administered program. These young people are showing some terrific leadership, and they give the rest of us cause for hope when it comes to the prospects for building a happy, drug-free next generation.

I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our wishes for a successful event to organizers Andrea Grygo and Mandy Enerson, and to all the others who have worked to make this event a reality.●

REGARDING MURPHY LECTURE ON ARTS AND PUBLIC POLICY

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important recent statement on a topic we are asked to address all too frequently in this body—governnment funding for the

arts and the role of the National Endowment for the Arts.

My colleagues know my views on this subject—views that are based on more than a quarter century of experiences in State government, private industry, and the U.S. Senate. My views also reflect the experiences of my State which is known all across the country for its leadership in virtually every aspect of arts activity—from several of the Nation's leading orchestras, theaters and museums to outstanding community-based arts organizations and thousands of individual artists.

And, finally, Mr. President, my reviews reflect a sincere appreciation and awareness of the important role that art plays in our local communities, in our States, in our country as a whole, and in the continual pursuit of an ever more civilized society which we as a nation aspire to achieve.

Few people could disagree with the notion that art plays a fundamental role in the great societies and movements in history which we deem valuable to study. What we are less likely to achieve a consensus over, is what we define as art, and what role government should play in supporting art, however it might be defined.

This debate over what art is, or what is "good art," or what art is worthy of public funding, has recently diverged from a healthy and productive discourse to very serious questioning of an institution which is and should remain an important and respected part of our Government, the National Endowment for the Arts.

Unfortunately, this questioning has provoked a degree of polarization on these questions which is neither healthy nor contributes to sound policymaking.

That's why I was so pleased to note that one of the Nation's arts leaders, Dr. Franklin Murphy, offered an insightful and thought provoking lecture on the issue of Federal support of the arts. Dr. Murphy, who is chairman of the board of the National Gallery of Art, offered his comments as the annual Nancy Hanks Lecture on Art and Public Policy. The lecture is sponsored by the American Council of the Arts.

Dr. Murphy's lecture is a refreshing voice of reason in a chorus of heightened political rhetoric. He points out, for example, that the vast majority of grants made by the NEA are noncontroversial and clearly in the public interest.

In my home State of Minnesota, since 1986 over $35 million has been awarded to a wide range of the arts including everything from support through the Minnesota State Arts Board with technical assistance programs for rural and inner-city local arts agencies to workshops to Native American artists to grants for numerous theaters, dance companies, and museums throughout the State.

These grants are an essential part of the continued development and strength of the arts all over Minnesota. And, I would guess, Mr. President, that if each Member of the Senate were to research NEA grants awarded to their own States, they would find the same thing: wholly noncontroversial grants going to many different Members and groups of their State's arts community.

Mr. President, because of its balanced, rational perspective on Government funding for the arts and the role of the NEA, I would ask that the concluding portion of Dr. Murphy's lecture be printed at this point in the RECORD. In this time of intense scrutiny of the NEA, reasoned voices are few, and should be awarded careful attention.

The concluding portion of the lecture follows:

PUBLIC FUNDING AND THE NEA

First, in summary, let me repeat that the vast percentage of cultural projects fully or partially funded by the federal government have not only been noncontroversial, but have enormously enriched the lives of Americans from coast to coast. The Congress in funding the National Gallery, the Smithsonian Museums (happily about to be joined by the Museum of the American Indian), and by providing the arts indemnity has permitted these mainly Washington-based institutions to receive and enrich the lives of the millions of Americans who visit their nation's capital every year. It has permitted the showcasing of the arts of Asia, Africa, and soon of the native American, thus enhancing the image and self-confidence of these ethnic groups which make up much of the mosaic which is our country today.

And, finally, in one of its finest hours, the Congress established the two National Endowments, one for the Arts and one for the Humanities. Now there was provided the opportunity to leave Washington and touch people in their own communities all across the country. Individual artists have been helped, the raising of private funds for the arts has been greatly stimulated, little theaters and dance groups have been established, and museums invigorated. Most heartening is that a number of ethnically based cultural groups or centers have been created or assisted. In short, there has been an explosion of arts activity in the United States in the last twenty years, and the National Endowment of the Arts deserves a major share of the credit.

However, in spite of an enormous amount of constructive activity, the Endowment has made a mere handful of grants, the reaction to which has all but eclipsed the great good brought by the vast majority of grants. Frankly, in my view the subjects of these few grants such as the exhibition of explicity sadomasochistic photographs and the publication of a book entitled "Live Sex Acts" have been understandably offensive in the extreme to the vast majority of Americans. Let me add that the right of artists to create such works is beyond question in our society; this controversy has nothing to do with artistic freedom. It has only to do with the expenditure of public funds in which the taxpayer has a very proper interest.

As you know, because of shrill attacks on the Endowment by people with different but all-destructive agendas, the Congress led by Congressmen Yates authorized a bipartisan commission charged with reviewing the grant-making procedures of the Endowment.

This twelve-person commission chaired by two distinguished and thoughtful Americans, John Brademas and Leonard Garment, and made up of a broad spectrum of highly competent people rendered a unanimous report in September 1990. In general the Commission called for a modest but important reform which in general called for greater scrutiny of proposed grants, avoidance of conflicts of interest on the part of panel members, and made clear the right and obligation not to slavishly follow the recommendation of each panel automatically, leaving genuine choices to the chairperson of the Endowment following review by the National Council members. Most important, the Commission unanimously recommended "against legislative changes to impose specific restrictions on the content of works of art supported by the Endowment."

So where are we at present in the matter of government and the arts and, more particularly, the National Endowment? I might start this set of conclusions by suggesting that we follow the lines of Kipling's poem If:

"* * * if you can keep your head while all about you others are losing theirs * * *."

I thought of these lines as I read a recent exchange in the Los Angeles Times: Christopher Knight, art critic, in an article headlined "Cloud of Politics Spreads Ominously Over Arts Grants Process" suggested that the nation's artists are about to be brought under the heavy hand of some kind of government control because the National Council had turned down a handful of 128 panel recommendations for funding (including two sexually explicit projects). My old friend, Charlton Heston—artist himself, tireless worker on behalf of the arts, and one-time member of the National Council of the Arts—responded referring to Knight's "hyperventilated prose" and suggesting that a 1.7% rejection rate is certainly less than Draconian. Heston then makes a point worth listening to:

"If enough constituents of enough congressmen feel their tax money is spent irresponsibly, Congress will deny the relevant funding; that's the simple reality. The First Amendment guarantees wide protection of public expressions. It does not guarantee public money to pay for it."

It is an indelible mark of our democracy that when public monies are expended on a thing, the public will expect to have its say. Politically, it is as practical to suggest that only artists should have a say about federal arts funding as it is to suggest that only the Department of Defense should have a say about defense spending. The federal government cannot be a totally disinterested patron of anything; the dollars it contributes to the arts, and everything else, have been extracted through the compulsion of civil law from the pockets of the people. The voices of the people and their government thus have their places in this process and this debate.

Alas, that debate has gone on too long and taken too high a toll. In spite of the enormous good the Endowment has brought millions of Americans, it is in trouble. It has just lost its head—a decent, intelligent, moderate man—to political expediency. A presidential candidate has called for its offices to be closed and fumigated. Some artists and art administrators—who deny the reality of accountability in the expenditure of public funds—continue to insist that artists be given public money to spend as only they see fit. Their attitude is that if the art offends

people and is contrary to generally accepted and reasonable standards, so be it. People don't have to look at or listen to it, they just have to pay for it. This proud posture crosses the line into arrogance and unreality, and plays into the hands of the demagogues of the right. Thus, discussions of the work of the Endowment are concentrated on minor and spurious issues—but such is the technique of the demagogue.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE OF NEA

So what are we, who admire the National Endowment and are profoundly grateful for its accomplishments, to do? I propose a compromise. Like most compromises, the only thing certain is that no one will like it at first. But like the best compromises, the logic of it may emerge over time. In essence, I propose that we strengthen our positions where we agree and moderate our positions where we disagree.

First, we must stop insisting on moral absolutes in a public, political environment which by its very nature cannot deal with moral absolutes on so subjective a subject. Let's all calm down.

Second, we must not forget that there are too many out there who think the arts are not very important and peripheral to their lives and interest. Therefore, those of us who understand the importance of the arts in enriching the spirit must work with ever greater vigor to personally support the arts and communicate our strong belief in these matters to our elected representatives. We can with quiet, polite, and persistent logic more than match reactionary bombast.

Third, I would ask my friends in the arts community to recognize that artistic freedom has never been at issue in this controversy. The expenditure of public funds has. Those who will condemn the Endowment if it doesn't make a certain few grants must be careful lest they sound just like those who will condemn it if it does. We are reaching the dangerous but familiar point where the misguided on both sides of an issue have taken up what is, in essence, the same chant.

Fourth, and most important of all, the National Council and the chairman and his staff must not fear to exert their fiduciary responsibility not only to support traditional art forms but also to encourage experimentation at the cutting edge. But I urge them to reconsider the use of public funds to support art that is overwhelmingly offensive to the mores of a large majority of the citizenry, else such support bring the whole temple down. There is too much at stake to risk all on what would prove to be a Pyrrhic victory. It might be well to remember the parable wherein, at the end, the kingdom was lost for want of a horseshoe nail.

Finally, let us agree that a strong, reasonable, and committed person must soon be appointed to succeed John Frohnmayer, and he or she must have unreserved support.

In conclusion, I do not believe it is asking too much of anyone, including those in the arts community, just to use good common sense. One thing I remember is that, with all of her other attributes, one thing Nancy Hanks possessed in abundance was common sense.●

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ANAHEIM FAMILY YMCA

● Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of an event that took place on April 17, the 25th anniversary of the Anaheim Family YMCA Annual Prayer Breakfast. As you know, the YMCA has instituted Christian principles through quality community programs that instill healthy minds, bodies, and spirits.

Since the inception of the Anaheim Family YMCA in 1911, they have worked to achieve the goals of the association worldwide. They have also strived to identify the specific needs of the Anaheim community. The Anaheim Family YMCA works with outside agencies, ranging from a gang prevention organization, local and county hospitals, a family counseling agency to three local churches and a group home for girls, all of which help to meet those needs of community.

The Anaheim YMCA also provides exceptional programs for families, such as child care, preschool, before and after school care, quality exercise programs and services for at-risk youths. The Anaheim YMCA works with the city of Anaheim on Project S.A.Y., a program that diverts at-risk youths from crime, gangs, and drug abuse.

Mr. President, I would ask that the Members of the Senate join me today in extending our deepest gratitude and highest commendations to the Anaheim Family YMCA for the vital role which it has played in the quality of life for the Anaheim community.●

IRVING J. SELIKOFF ARCHIVES AND RESEARCH CENTER DEDICATION

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an extremely dedicated individual, Prof. Irving J. Selikoff, M.D. On May 1, 1992, Mount Sinai Medical Center will honor Dr. Selikoff at a dedication ceremony of the Irving J. Selikoff Archives and Research Center. Irving is a dear friend of mine and I have learned a great deal about life, ethics, and public policy from him. His commitment to making the world a better place to live has been an inspiration to me and has further spurred my efforts to improve the public health.

Irving is a man of unparalleled commitment to the prevention, treatment, and cure of disease. During his years at Mt. Sinai, he gained distinction first as an expert in the diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis and later as one of the world's leaders in occupational and environmental medicine.

Dr. Selikoff's career began with training and experience as a physician treating ailments of the chest. He specialized in the treatment, clinical management, and prevention of tuberculosis. Irving's most important achievement in this field, in collaboration with Dr. E.H. Robitzek, was his discovery of the value of isoniazid therapy in the treatment of tuberculosis. This finding opened up an effective new cure for treating this chronic disease. Drs. Selikoff and Robitzek were recognized for their work in developing isoniazid therapy and were awarded the Albert Lasker Award of the American Public Health Association in 1955. The Albert Lasker Award is the highest recognition given for achievement in public health in the United States.

Irving then went on to pursue a new challenge which would again change the way Americans live. His new interest was in the study of occupational medicine, specializing in the entire spectrum of the diseases caused by asbestos, including carcinogenicity. In 1954, Irving first encountered patients with asbestos-induced disease. He found an unexpectedly high incidence of unusual lung disease in persons who worked at a rubber and asbestos company in New Jersey. After studying the findings in these patients, Irving found a correlation between the disease and the patient's occupational exposure to asbestos. In 1962, Irving began a study with the members of Locals 12 and 32 of the Asbestos Workers Union in New York City and in Newark, NJ. This study led to the recognition of the spectrum of disease due to the occupational exposure to asbestos.

The results of his research were first made public at the landmark 1964 conference of the New York Academy of Sciences, "Biological Effects of Asbestos," which was organized and chaired by Dr. Selikoff. He and his colleagues provided evidence that proved that three major diseases—asbestosis, lung cancer and mesothelioma—were caused by exposure to asbestos.

In association with the American Cancer Society, Irving began a comprehensive evaluation of the epidemiology of asbestos disease in all of the 17,800 members of the AFL–CIO International Union of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers throughout the United States and Canada. This study has provided the most detailed knowledge of the chronic health effects of exposure to asbestos available anywhere in the world.

In addition, his contributions to the prevention of asbestos related disease, Irving has researched occupational disease caused by other hazardous materials. He examined tens of thousands of workers exposed to materials including dioxins, mercury, fluorides, vinyl chloride, and lead. Irving has organized and chaired conferences in the United States, Canada, Europe, South Africa, and Japan. These meetings have provided scientists from around the world with information on the prevention of diseases caused by minerals, dusts, chemicals, solvents, and other physical or chemical agents. Irving's interests also led him to contribute to the study of AIDS. He chaired one of the earliest conferences in the United States discussing the tragic health effects of AIDS.

In addition, Irving organized a convocation held under the sponsorship of an organization which he founded in 1983 called the Collegium Ramazzini, an international assembly of scientists involved in the prevention of occupational disease. This conference demonstrated conclusively that asbestos in buildings across the United States posed a significant hazard to building occupants and to the public and emphasized the need for national action to control exposure. The results of the conference will soon be published and will represent the Eleventh Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. This publication was edited by Dr. Selikoff.

Mr. President, Irving's research on the link between asbestos exposure and lung cancer paved the way for new standards of occupational safety. His work stands as a cornerstone for researchers around the world in the study of occupational disease. His selfless and tireless efforts to improve the safety of Americans who work in hazardous workplaces is an inspiration to us all.

Mr. President, I know what it means to lose a loved one to an occupational disease. My father died of cancer after years of working in a silk mill in my home town of Paterson, NJ. Irving's work has prevented so many families from having to experience such a loss.

The Irving J. Selikoff Archives and Research Center at Mt. Sinai stands as living testimony to Irving's uncompromised dedication to medical research and education. I extend to him my heartiest congratulations and warmest wishes on this occasion. He is a valued friend and it is an honor knowing him.●

IN RECOGNITION OF RESIDENT AGENT IN CHARGE CHARLES PRATT

● Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Resident Agent in Charge Charles Pratt of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms upon his recognition by the Federal Bar Association at their Third Annual Salute to Federal Law Enforcement Officers Luncheon which was held on April 21, 1992.

Agent Pratt is to be highly commended for his extraordinary efforts above and beyond the call of duty. On June 18, 1991, Resident Agent in Charge Pratt and Special Agents Michael Dawkins, John Carr, and Patrick Leahey, found themselves in a shootout initiated by Darryl Mason, a convicted felon who had a history of narcotic trafficking, assault with a deadly weapon, robbery, burglary, and carrying a concealed weapon.

During a surveillance and planned "buy-bust," the ATF had planned to execute an outstanding Federal arrest warrant for Mason. All ATF personnel involved in the operation were informed of the intended surveillance of an undercover meeting between a confidential informant and Mason for the purchase of one kilogram of "rock" cocaine.

After the informant made the initial contact, he informed the agents that Mason and the other suspects were getting the drugs and that the deal would proceed momentarily. A short time thereafter, two suspects were observed entering the garage beneath the apartment complex approaching two Mustang convertibles which were parked side by side in the garage. The agents observed Mason open the trunk of one of the vehicles. Fearing that the suspects were going to try to leave the area, the arrest team called for the execution of the Federal arrest warrant on Mason.

As the arrest team entered the garage, they announced "Federal Officers with a warrant," and yelled, "Police, get down." The other suspect, Victor Pugh, although armed, immediately dropped his weapon and complied with the agents' instruction. Upon entering the garage, they observed that Mason had removed a large weapon from the trunk of his vehicle and began to fire on the agents. Dawkins, who was in the center of the garage, without cover, returned fire with his shotgun. After being bombarded with gunfire, Dawkins sustained a gunshot wound to his foot. He tried to keep moving but fell to the ground as his foot could no longer support him. He dropped his shotgun in the fall but immediately drew his handgun and continued to fire at Mason.

Upon realizing that Dawkins was wounded and still being fired upon, Agents Pratt, Carr, and Leahey, seeking to draw the gunman's attention away from Dawkins, moved their positions and continued to fire upon Mason.

Despite warnings to "freeze and get down," Mason failed to heed the instructions and continued to fire upon the agents. He then turned and fired on Agent Pratt. Pratt responded by firing two rounds from his shotgun, which hit the suspect, causing him to fall to the floor and was immediately handcuffed.

If it were not for the quick response of Agents Pratt, Carr, and Leahey, without concern for their personal safety, it is possible that the gunman could have advanced on the unprotected Agent Dawkins, thereby causing much more serious injuries to the exposed agent.

Mr. President, I would ask that the members of the Senate join me today in extending our deepest gratitude and highest commendations to Resident Agent in Charge Pratt upon his receipt of the Federal Bar Association's Medal of Valor for exemplary service above and beyond the call of duty.●

WORKERS MEMORIAL DAY

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Workers Memorial Day which is being observed today. Workers Memorial Day, sponsored by the AFL–CIO, is being held to remember those workers who have been killed, paralyzed and injured due to unsafe and hazardous working conditions.

Each year over 6 million workers are injured on the job and 60,000 workers are permanently disabled; 10,000 workers are killed every year by workplace hazards. That's one worker every hour every day. Many workers are either not trained or poorly trained to operate potentially dangerous equipment. Furthermore, hundreds of thousands of American workers are exposed to dangerously high levels of toxic substances. Many employees are afraid they will lose their jobs if they complain about unsafe conditions to their managements.

We all remember the tragedy that occurred on September 3, 1991, just a day after Labor Day, in Hamlet, NC where 25 workers died in a fire at a poultry processing plant because they were trapped behind locked doors. In all the 11 years the Hamlet plant had been in operation, it was never once visited by State or Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration inspectors. This much change.

The horror at Hamlet is not an isolated incident. It is no surprise that it was never inspected. With only 1,200 OSHA inspectors to inspect 5 million workplaces, a workplace can expect to be inspected only once every 79 years.

Twenty-two years ago, when Congress passed the Occupational Safety and Health Administration Act, it promised every worker a safe place to work. Progress has been made because of the OSHA Act, but more needs to be done to make that promise of a safe job a reality for America's workers. If we value our American workers we must train them well and retrain them as new equipment and methods come into use. We must also hire more OSHA inspectors, set more specific inspection guidelines, and initiate stiffer penalties on OSHA violators.

We can make some sweeping changes if we pass S. 1622, a bill to reform the OSHA Act of 1970. S. 1622 requires joint employer-employee health and safety committees at every worksite with more than 10 employees. In addition, S. 1622 provides confidentiality to workers who complain about dangers on the job and mandates that OSHA provide services to the 7 million public employees currently not covered.

We must ensure that every worker's legal right to a safe worksite becomes a reality, not just a promise. I hope you will join me today in thinking of those who have been harmed by unsafe workplaces and in trying to reform OHSA to prevent more senseless tragedies in the future.●

SISTER CITIES: CHINO VALLEY, AZ, AND SONORA, MEXICO

• Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a partnership between two countries—not a partnership of political dignitaries, but a partnership of communities, a community in Arizona and a community in Sonora, Mexico.

The town of Chino Valley has entered into an agreement with the Sister City Program to establish ties with Papalote (Ejido Desierto) Sonora, Mexico. This partnership is intended to develop unity between the two cities by promoting the understanding of cultures and the exchanging of ideas.

The concept of Sister City was founded by the President of the United States in 1956 to establish friendships and understanding between the citizens of the United States and people from around the world by means of personal contact.

The town of Chino Valley, by a vote of the council, has chosen to participate in this program with the hope of furthering unity between two nations and two cities, one person at a time.

Mr. President, I commend the leaders of these towns. This Nation was established by the people and for the people. These towns are the people—citizens building friendships and improving understanding between countries, one person at a time.•

AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURING INSTITUTE'S ENCOURAGING ENVIRONMENTAL EXCELLENCE

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor four South Carolina companies for their leadership in protecting the environment. These four companies: Inman Mills, Inman, SC; Milliken & Co., Spartanburg, SC; Mount Vernon Mills, Inc., Greenville, SC; and Springs Industries, Inc., of Fort Mill, SC, are charter members of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute's Encouraging Environmental Excellence Program. The program requires participating companies to follow a 10-point plan which includes developing a corporate environmental policy, conducting environmental audits, establishing company goals, developing employee and community education programs, working closely with Government policymakers and establishing outreach programs with suppliers and customers to encourage recycling and environmentally efficient processing.

I want to commend these four companies for their work. They have displayed an admirable commitment to a clean world. It is particularly noteworthy when you consider that these businesses face foreign competitors who operate without regard to the environment.•

IN RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL AGENT PILOT ALAN HOWARD WINN

• Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Special Agent Pilot Alan Howard Winn of the Drug Enforcement Administration upon his posthumous recognition by the Federal Bar Association at their Third Annual Salute to Federal Law Enforcement Officers luncheon which was held on April 21, 1992.

Agent Winn is to be highly commended for his extraordinary efforts above and beyond the call of duty. On August 13, 1991, Special Agent Pilot Winn died at the age of 37 while piloting a DEA helicopter. Special Agent Winn had made an emergency crash landing in a remote and rugged area north of Hilo, HI. At the time of the crash, Special Agent Winn, while piloting the helicopter, was able to bring the three other officers safely to the ground. The helicopter then rolled over and Agent Winn was knocked unconscious. The helicopter struck the ground abruptly, bursting into flames. Special Agent Winn died when the fire and explosion kept the others from rescuing him.

Special Agent Winn was an exemplary member of the DEA who died bravely in the line of duty. He knew the danger of being a law enforcement officer and that being a helicopter pilot certainly added to that danger. In this instance, in order to save the lives of three other officers, he made the supreme sacrifice by giving his life to his country. He was a true hero in his efforts to fight international drug trafficking.

The following quote was from his father, Howard Winn:

> One of Alan's ambitions was to be a pilot, and he did that. Another was to serve his country as best he could, and he did that. He was aware of the inherent risks involved with the duty he was performing, but he wanted to serve in this manner, and he was proud to do so. And each of us is justifiably proud of him and the life he lived and gave for all of us.

Mr. President, I would ask that the Members of the Senate join me today in extending our deepest gratitude, condolences, and highest commendations to Special Agent Pilot Alan Howard Winn upon his receipt of the Federal Bar Association's Medal of Valor for exemplary service above and beyond the call of duty.•

CONGRATULATING MOUNTAIN VIEW HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC TEAM

• Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure and pride that I come to the floor to congratulate Mountain View High School which represented Arizona in the recent annual Academic Decathlon held in Boise, ID. The team of Dan Arai, Nat Clarkson, Paul Hlavacek, Andrea Jackson, Renee Larson, Gina Parizek, Soren Ragsdale, Tyson Rogers, and Christy Roorda coached by Mary McGovern placed second in the Nation. The theme for the competition this year was Environmental Science, and the team from Arizona scored 49,475 points out of a possible 60,000, covering 10 subjects from math to science to the social sciences, just 235 points behind Texas. Their team score of 49,475 is the second highest ever recorded in the history of the national competition. Not only did Arizona place second in the overall competition, but it placed well in the individual competitions and finished with a total of 46 medals.

This is the third year in a row that the team from Mountain View High School in Mesa, AZ, has won the State competition and advanced to the nationals. In the past, the nine-member teams have been predominately made up of seniors and male students; however, this year's team had four juniors and four females. I am confident that next year's team will come back experienced and hungry for first place when they compete on their home turf in Phoenix, AZ, where the 1993 Academic Decathlon will be held.

These nine students, together with all those who competed in the Academic Decathlon, represent a bright spot in our public school system during a time when, as a Nation, we are struggling to compete academically. I know my colleagues join me in wishing all the students who competed in the Academic Decathlon continued success in their educational pursuits. Mr. President, I ask that a Mesa Tribune article of Thursday, April 23, 1992, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Mesa Tribune, Apr. 23, 1992]

A CAPITAL TRIP: MOUNTAIN VIEW TEAM GOES TO WASHINGTON FOR BUSH VISIT

(By Patricia Likens)

After placing second in the national Academic Decathlon, even meeting President Bush isn't such a big deal.

"We're not sure that we're going to get a chance to talk to him," said team member Paul Hlavacek of Mountain View High School in Mesa.

After months of preparation—studying after school and during weekends—Hlavacek and his teammates placed second in the nation at the annual Academic Decathlon in Boise, Idaho.

The team flew to Washington on Wednesday to meet the president and tour the city.

In the past 10 months, the students worked two hours almost every day after school and most weekends preparing for the decathlon.

"We watched our social lives go up in flames," said Hlavacek as his teammates laughed and agreed.

The newfound friends learned to work together preparing for the decathlon, which demanded knowledge of 10 subjects including math, science and the social sciences.

"The people on this team never would have met if it weren't for the decathlon," said senior Gina Parizek. "We've become buds."

They often worked together in study groups and looked to one another for their various areas of expertise.

"There's really no way to prepare for it," said senior Renee Larson.

It was the third year in a row that a Mountain View academic team won the state competition and made it to the nationals.

"The team either comes together or it doesn't," said Coach Mary McGovern. "They have to learn to share and help each other, especially in math and science."

Perserverance and an edge of competitiveness also help along the way, she added.

And then there's luck.

When junior Christy Roorda was given seven seconds to decide in which direction—clockwise or counter-clockwise—water flows down the drain in the northern hemisphere, she said she "thought of a bathtub and got it right." The answer is counter-clockwise.

J. Frank Dobie High School, an all-male team from Pasadena, Texas, won the nationals with a score of 49,710 to Mountain View's 49,475.

The nine-member team's makeup was unique this year, McGovern said.

"In the past the teams have been largely males and seniors. This year, we had four juniors and four girls on the team," she said.

Many of the students said they learned more than can be found in books.

"I learned how to interview and how to put my best self forward," Larson said.

Other team members were juniors Dan Arni, Andrea Jackson, and Soren Ragsdale, and seniors Tyson Rogers and Nat Clarkson.

Rogers took first place in the nation in the competitor's honors category, Jackson won second place in the same category and Larson took second place in the scholastic division.•

IN RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL AGENT JOHN CARR

• Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Special Agent John Carr of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms upon his recognition by the Federal Bar Association at their Third Annual Salute to Federal Law Enforcement Officers Luncheon which was held on April 21, 1992.

Agent Carr is to be highly commended for his extraordinary efforts above and beyond the call of duty. On June 18, 1991, Resident Agent in Charge Pratt and Special Agents Michael Dawkins, John Carr, and Patrick Leahey, found themselves in a shootout initiated by Darryl Mason, a convicted felon who had a history of narcotic trafficking, assault with a deadly weapon, robbery, burglary and carrying a concealed weapon.

During a surveillance and planned buy/bust, the ATF had planned to execute an outstanding Federal arrest warrant for Mason. All ATF personnel involved in the operation were informed of the intended surveillance of an undercover meeting between a confidential informant and Mason for the purchase of 1 kilogram of rock cocaine.

After the informant made the initial contact, he informed the agents that Mason and the other suspects were getting the drugs and that the deal would proceed momentarily. A short time thereafter, two suspects were observed entering the garage beneath the apartment complex approaching two Mustang convertibles which were parked side by side in the garage. The agents observed Mason open the trunk of one of the vehicles. Fearing that the suspects were going to try to leave the area, the arrest team called for the execution of the Federal arrest warrant on Mason.

As the arrest team entered the garage, they announced "Federal officers with a warrant" and yelled, "police, get down." The other suspect, Victor Pugh, although armed, immediately dropped his weapon and complied with the agents' instruction. Upon entering the garage, they observed that Mason had removed a large weapon from the trunk of his vehicle and began to fire on the agents. Dawkins, who was in the center of the garage, without cover, returned fire with his shotgun. After being bombarded with gunfire, Dawkins sustained a gunshot wound to his foot. He tried to keep moving but fell to the ground as his foot could no longer support him. He dropped his shotgun in the fall but immediately drew his handgun and continued to fire at Mason.

Upon realizing that Dawkins was wounded and still being fired upon, Agents Pratt, Carr, and Leahey, seeking to draw the gunman's attention away from Dawkins, moved their positions and continued to fire upon Mason.

Despite warnings to "freeze and get down," Mason failed to heed the instructions and continued to fire upon the agents. He then turned and fired on Agent Pratt. Pratt responded by firing two rounds from his shotgun, which hit the suspect, causing him to fall to the floor and was immediately handcuffed.

If it were not for the quick response of Agents Pratt, Carr, and Leahey, without concern for their personal safety, it is possible that the gunman could have advanced on the unprotected Agent Dawkins, thereby causing much more serious injuries to the exposed agents.

Mr. President, I would ask that the Members of the Senate join me today in extending our deepest gratitude and highest commendations to Special Agent Carr upon his receipt of the Federal Bar Association's Metal of Valor for exemplary service above and beyond the call of duty.•

U.N. CONFERENCE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, the Senate approved Senator KERRY's bill, Senate Concurrent Resolution 89, calling on the President to attend the U.N. Conference on the Environment and Development. I applaud Senator KERRY for his leadership in this area. In view of the approaching Conference in June, I would like to make a few remarks.

It will take courage, vision, and leadership on the part of all nations of the world to make the changes that we need. One of the worst legacies of the Reagan administration was the abandonment of environmental issues, and we are now paying for that neglect. The responsibility to preserve and protect our natural resources for the enjoyment of future generations should be one of our highest priorities. To reverse the damaging changes we are seeing in our atmosphere will be difficult, of great cost, and achieved only over a long period of time.

President Bush says he will attend the Conference only if it is "in the best interest of the United States." Mr. President, how could this conference to promote global agreement and awareness to protect the Earth, not be in our best interest? Our Nation is not exempt from what we preach is in the best interest of all.

If we are going to ask other countries to change their ways, we must set an example. It is unacceptable for the President to ignore his duty to represent the United States at this important gathering of world leaders.

Much of our environmental deterioration is caused by patterns of production and consumption, especially in the industrialized countries. Although industrialized nations only represent about 25 percent of the world's population, we account for three-quarters of global CO_2 emissions associated with energy production and use.

A healthy environment and a healthy economy are not mutually exclusive. It is possible that we can reduce greenhouse emissions in a way that will actually benefit the economy. Based on a recent study by four U.S. environmental groups, by the year 2030 policies to encourage energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources could cut the Nation's energy requirements by half, petroleum by two-thirds, and carbon dioxide emissions by 70 percent, with net savings to the U.S. energy consumers of $2.3 trillion. Clearly, we need to be doing more.

I urge President Bush to reconsider his position and represent our Nation at the upcoming Conference.•

IN RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL AGENT EDWARD FOLLIS

• Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Special Agent Edward Follis of the Drug Enforcement Administration upon his recognition by the Federal Bar Association at their Third Annual Salute to Federal Law Enforcement Officers Luncheon which was held on April 21, 1992.

Agent Follis is to be highly commended for his extraordinary efforts above and beyond the call of duty. Special Agent Follis initiated an undercover investigation in August 1990 of a Nigerian drug trafficking organization.

This international drug ring was importing China-white heroin, Persian-brown heroin and Southwest African marijuana from Nigeria to Los Angeles.

Follis, in his undercover role, was able to ultimately meet the head or the kingpin of this organization, gained his confidence, and gathered solid evidence which ultimately led to the dismantling of this organization and the arrest of its chief executive officer. During the course of this undercover assignment, Special Agent Follis was introduced to other organizational members located in the Los Angeles area who were documented as extremely dangerous and violent.

This investigation culminated with the arrest of 16 defendants. It also resulted in the seizure of 1 metric ton of marijuana, 3 machine guns, 32 silencers, 7 hand-grenades, stolen bearer bonds valued at one-half million dollars, counterfeit money, and the seizure of 7 automobiles. Follis, through highly skilled and tireless undercover work, was able to penetrate this organization at the highest level, and completely dismantle this complex international heroin and marijuana smuggling organization. He frequently met suspects while they were heavily armed and the threat of violence was ever present.

Mr. President, I would ask that the Members of the Senate join me today in extending our deepest gratitude and highest commendations to Special Agent Edward Follis upon his receipt of the Federal Bar Association's Medal of Valor for exemplary service above and beyond the call of duty.●

RECOGNITION OF DR. EUGENE SMITH

● Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a man who devoted his entire professional career to improving one of Arkansas' institutions of higher education.

Dr. Eugene Smith began his professional career at Arkansas State University in 1958 after completing his doctor of education degree at the University of Mississippi. He will end his professional career at Arkansas State University at the end of this academic year.

Although Dr. Smith's career began and will end at the same institution, the ASU of 1992 is far different from the ASU of 1958. Some of the changes at ASU would undoubtedly have occurred without Eugene Smith, but many of them are directly attributable to his hard work and dedication.

Dr. Smith could have chosen an easier professional route than the one he followed. He has served in almost every administrative position imaginable in a university, from director of graduate programs to president. While I was Governor, Dr. Smith was vice president for administration and I enjoyed an excellent working relationship with him. In every position, with every promotion, during every day of his career, his commitment to the university he served never wavered. When he first applied for the position of president of the university, someone else was selected. Others might have been so personally disappointed that they would have left, but Dr. Smith stayed. The institution was more important to him than his personal ambition. In fact, it would be fair to say that his personal ambition and the welfare of the institution are one and the same.

In 1984, Dr. Smith became the eighth president of the university and announced that he had three goals: to expand the library; to elevate the football program to 1A status; and to create a doctoral program for the university. The library was expanded, the football team is 1A, and when the university received approval to grant doctoral degrees 2 weeks ago, his third and final goal was met.

It is difficult for me to imagine an ASU without Dr. Smith. He probably comes about as close to being irreplaceable as anybody could be. The alumni association at Arkansas State University has a slogan, "Alumni—the Heart of ASU." If alumni are the heart of ASU, Eugene Smith must be its soul.●

WORKERS MEMORIAL DAY

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, as you are aware, today is "Workers Memorial Day." The purpose of this memorial day is to bring to the Nation's attention the unacceptably high number of workers who are seriously or fatally injured each year. The number of work-related accidents and illnesses is unacceptable not only because it is a significant drain on our economy, but, more importantly, because it results in significant human tragedy. Each day, thousands of workers are injured. More than 10,000 Americans die from job-related injuries and illnesses each year.

It was with the intent of reducing work-related injuries and illnesses that Congress enacted the Occupational Safety and Health Act more than 20 years ago. The act was supposed to increase the safety of the American worker. Unfortunately, OSHA has not been as successful as hoped. Although some progress has been made, there are still far too many workers getting hurt.

Perhaps just as importantly, the people who rely on OSHA, both employers and employees, have lost faith in the system established by the OSH Act of 1970. Employees and employers alike no longer believe that the labyrinth of current OSHA regulations and enforcement efforts can succeed in protecting America's workers effectively.

Mr. President, it appears to me that we are at an important crossroads in worker safety. We can either continue down a path that many believe is ineffective and incomprehensible, or we seek out new, innovative ways to impact worker safety.

I am encouraged by what I believe to be a sincere effort within Congress and elsewhere to explore new alternatives to reduce work related accidents. One of the most exciting experiments I am aware of is underway in my home State of New Mexico. Labor, management, and public sector leaders there have joined forces to form the Safety Resource Council of New Mexico.

The Safety Resource Council of New Mexico is a volunteer effort. Its members include representatives from the State of New Mexico, the New Mexico Federation of Labor, the Rio Grande chapter of the American Industrial Hygiene Association, the New Mexico chapter of the America Society of Safety Engineers, and the private sector.

Together, these professionals are determined to identify safety resources within New Mexico that employers and employees can draw on to improve safety. The Safety Resource Council of New Mexico also hopes to sponsor industry-specific projects to reduce injuries and illnesses. Although the safety resource council is a new organization, it is already working on a safety conference for employees in the entertainment industry, and has plans for safety projects in retail grocery and oil and gas industries. The safety resource council believes its efforts will result in greater initiative by citizens to reduce accidents and injuries experienced by individual and businesses in their communities. This initiative will also result in improved productivity, an enhanced economy, and renewed pride New Mexicans feel for their communities and their State.

What I find most exciting about the safety resource council's effort, however, is not the specific projects it will initiate. Instead, I am excited about the attitude of those involved. Safety resource council members firmly believe that the interests of management and labor are not to be in conflict where safety is concerned; they realize that all parties gain when work related injuries and illnesses are reduced. Furthermore, the safety resource council is committed to the idea that all parties can and should work as a team to improve work place safety.

Mr. President, I believe that the rest of the Nation can learn from what the Safety Resource Council of New Mexico is doing in my home State. It is a shining example of what can be achieved when management and labor set aside differences to pursue common goals. It is hard to imagine a better goal to pursue than the increased safety of America's workers.●

IN RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL AGENT JAMES B. SNOW II

• Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Special Agent James B. Snow II of the Federal Bureau of Investigation upon his recognition by the Federal Bar Association at their Third Annual Salute to Federal Law Enforcement Officers luncheon which was held on April 21, 1992.

Agent Snow is to be highly commended for his extraordinary efforts above and beyond the call of duty. Since November 24, 1988, Special Agent Snow has been one of the primary undercover agents investigating drug trafficking activities of the Bloods and Crips street gangs. The Bloods and Crips street gang account for numerous violent crimes including homicides, assaults, drive-by shootings, and robberies. They are heavily involved in crack cocaine drug trafficking and have expanded their trafficking activities beyond the borders of California. Experts estimate that the Bloods and Crips street gangs are responsible for one-third of the U.S. crack cocaine market.

For 1 year, Special Agent Snow was an undercover agent in an investigation code named "Urban Siege." He frequently associated with various street gang members in neighborhoods where violence is the norm. He purchased quantities of drugs from violence prone gang members and acquired, on a daily basis, significant information for operational analysis. At great risk to his personal safety, Agent Snow obtained relevant information for utilization in affidavits to support electronic wire intercepts. These intercepts revealed inside information regarding the size, scope, and nature of the drug organization. "Urban Siege" culminated with the execution of 11 search warrants, seizure of assets valued in excess of one million dollars and the arrest of 20 street gang members and associates. All the arrested individuals have since been convicted and sentenced to Federal prison.

Since December 1989, Special Agent Snow has been the principal undercover agent in two other FBI street gang drug investigations. These investigations involved dangerous gang members who have amassed millions of dollars in assets and managed a very complex and sophisticated nationwide drug organization, which far exceeds the "Urban Siege" statistics.

Mr. President, I would ask that the Members of the Senate join me today in extending our deepest gratitude and highest commendations to Special Agent James B. Snow II upon his receipt of the Federal Bar Association's Medal of Valor for exemplary service above and beyond the call of duty.•

TRIBUTE TO CARMEN DELGADO VOTAW

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a Maryland woman who was recently inducted into the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame. Carmen Delgado Votaw has spent her life working for the advancement of Hispanics and women. A native of Puerto Rico, Ms. Votaw has become a national and international civil rights advocate and I am proud to recognize her achievements here today.

Ms. Votaw has served on and presided over several commissions which reflect her contributions to women in Maryland, the Nation, and indeed to women worldwide. Through her involvement with the overseas education fund of the League of Women Voters, Ms. Votaw sought to spread the empowerment of U.S. women to women in other nations. Her leadership abilities are evident in her service on the Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year [IWY Commission]. Ms. Votaw received two Presidential appointments; as the U.S. delegate of the IWY Commission and as cochair on the National Advisory Committee for Women. Also, Ms. Votaw remains a powerful advocate for her native Puerto Ricans. She served as national president of the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women and on their national board for several years and worked for years on the Hill representing Puerto Rico.

Indeed, Ms. Votaw has gone beyond her professional duties to ensure that the voices of women and minorities do not go unheard. Ms. Votaw regularly attended the General Assembly and other branches of the Organization of American States, as well as three world conferences of women in Mexico, Denmark and Kenya. Meeting with heads of state and other world leaders, Ms. Votaw has been a strong and vocal force in the movement to ratify international covenants which protect women's rights.

In addition to these many worthy activities, Ms. Votaw has authored several books to increase awareness of Hispanic contributions and women's contributions worldwide. In 1982 Hood College in Frederick, MD, awarded to Ms. Votaw the degree of doctor of humanities honoris causa. Currently, Ms. Votaw lends her gifts and powerful voice of advocacy to young women as the Washington representative for Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

I am honored today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of Carmen Delgado Votaw and I commend her on her hard work for others and on her place of honor in the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame. For over 20 years of service to women and Hispanics, I say thank you to Carmen Delgado Votaw.•

DOUGLAS' TAIWAN DEAL GOUGING AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, bad enough that McDonnell Douglas brushed aside American partners in favor of a Taiwanese sugar daddy to bankroll its next commercial airliner, the MD–12, but teaming with a foreign investor also guarantees another gouging of the American taxpayer to the tune of $350 million. Why? Because, by splitting Douglas into separate commercial and military divisions, overhead costs for the C–17 will increase.

I ask that the full text of the Los Angeles Times article: "Costs of Douglas' Taiwan Deal Cited," be printed in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

Is there no way to stem the hemorrhaging of taxpayer dollars into McDonnell Douglas' coffers?

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 8, 1992]

COSTS OF DOUGLAS' TAIWAN DEAL CITED

(By Ralph Vartabedian)

Aerospace: A fleet of C–17 jets would cost the U.S. Government an estimated $350 million more if the firm sells a stake to a Taiwanese group, the Air Force says.

The government would pay an estimated $350 million more for its fleet of McDonnell Douglas C–17 cargo jets as a result of the firm's plan to sell a stake in its commercial aircraft business to a Taiwanese group, Air Force officials said Tuesday.

McDonnell—by splitting its Douglas Aircraft unit into separate commercial and military divisions as part of the deal—would increase "overhead" costs on the 120-plane C–17 program by about $3 million per aircraft, according to a study by the Air Force and the Defense Contract Management Command.

While McDonnell officials have testified in recent congressional hearings that the sale to Taiwan Aerospace Corp. would protect American technology and jobs, the question of how the deal would affect the Pentagon's costs never was raised, members of Congress and their staffs said Tuesday.

The $350-million figure is the government's "best estimate" of the potential cost impact, representing about 1% of the C–17 program's total $35 billion cost, according to a spokesman for the Air Force Aeronautical Systems Division in Dayton, Ohio. The added costs could rise to about $1 billion in the worst case or total less than the $350 million in the best case, he added.

McDonnell signed a preliminary agreement last November to sell Taiwan Aerospace up to 40% of its troubled commercial aircraft business in Long Beach for $2 billion. The deal may yet be restructured or scaled back, as officials in Taiwan weigh the findings of a comprehensive review of the transaction. A McDonnell spokesman declined to comment Tuesday on the Air Force cost estimates.

The increase in overhead costs on the huge cargo jets apparently would include facility costs, certain staff salaries and other costs that up to now have been pooled with the firm's commercial programs. The government would bear the additional overhead costs on future C–17 production contracts, which are negotiated annually.

In addition, some work performed by the commercial operation for the C–17 would have to be negotiated between the two organizations, according to Brig. Gen. Kenneth G. Miller, the Air Force's C–17 program manager.

The potential for a cost increase evoked a loud reaction from some members of Congress, who have expressed concern that the Taiwan deal would harm American interests.

Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.), chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, said that after two hearings by his panel on the Taiwan deal, he was left with the impression that McDonnell's strong defense business historically had subsidized its weak commercial aircraft business—not the reverse.

"I have trouble squaring that notion with this conclusion by the Air Force," Bingaman said. "I have real trouble getting that to compute."

Rep. John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.), chairman of the House Government Operations Committee and one of the firm's harshest critics, issued this statement: "We have long suspected that the C-17 would feel the impact of the McDonnell Douglas sale to the Taiwanese. The American taxpayers should not and will not foot the bill for this transfer." Meanwhile, Miller, the Air Force's C-17 program manager, said in a wideranging interview last week that McDonnell is making good progress in improving its efficiency on the C-17 program.

But the improvements had been anticipated, and Miller said the firm is still likely to incur an $850-million cost overrun on the first six planes. McDonnell has insisted that it will break even.

Miller said the firm is building each subsequent C-17 with just 75% of the labor hours of the previous aircraft—a measure of McDonnell's learning process.

Although Miller said that rate is about average compared to other programs, it apparently is not enough to save McDonnell from huge losses looming on the C-17. Rather, that learning curve confirms Air Force estimates that it will cost $7.45 billion to complete the initial C-17 contract.

Still, Miller was upbeat about the aircraft itself.

"We know their manufacturing process has more refinements that need to be made, but the product that is coming out the door is magnificent," the general said.

"Could they do it more efficiently? Yes. Is it perfect as it comes down the production line? No. But between their quality assurance folks and the [defense] quality assurance folks, what actually comes out the door and what is delivered to the Air Force, the taxpayer is a magnificent flying machine," he said. "And we are thrilled to death with its performance so far in the test program. It is really more than anybody would reasonably hope for when you look at any airplane that has come along in the past 50 years in the Air Force."

Still, the Air Force and McDonnell have had to postpone flying the first production model C-17 until mid-April after a C-17 test model had to be grounded three times since Oct. 31 at Edwards Air Force Base because of concerns about fuel leaks.

After intensively looking at the problem, Miller said it appears that the company's procedures and worker training need improvement.

The firm has already produced six or seven sets of wings, and there are concerns that those too might have fuel leaks. Miller said the cost of fixing those wings will be borne by McDonnell.

TRIBUTE TO IRVING J. SELIKOFF, M.D.

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise to give tribute and honor to a remarkable American physician, Dr. Irving J. Selikoff of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York. Dr. Selikoff has made an enormous contribution to the field of medicine through his half century of dedicated research, through his teaching of hundreds of young physicians, and through his courageous leadership in formulation of health policy. As his career draws to a close, it is right and fitting that the U.S. Senate, on behalf of the millions of Americans who have benefited from Dr. Selikoff's many contributions, give praise and honor to this man.

Mr. President, Dr. Selikoff has made internationally recognized contributions to medical science in two distinct areas. Together with his colleague Dr. E.H. Robitzek, Dr. Selikoff was the first to show the efficacy of INH in the treatment of tuberculosis. Utilization of INH continues to be the drug of choice in the global war on tuberculosis. Indeed, the disease recognition and treatment approach pioneered by Dr. Selikoff provided dramatic gains in prevention of millions of cases of tuberculosis worldwide. It is unfortunate that this treatment plan so carefully developed by Dr. Selikoff has not been adequately pursued over the last two decades. As a result, we are now faced with significant increases in tuberculosis rates, a serious problem with multidrug resistant tuberculosis, and a rising epidemic of AIDS-related tuberculosis. The recurrence of tuberculosis related to AIDS was also forecast by Dr. Selikoff who sponsored one of the first AIDS conferences in the United States.

Mr. President, Dr. Selikoff's second internationally significant contribution was his recognition and research on asbestos related diseases, and many other occupationally related diseases. Dr. Selikoff's extensive research on asbestos over three decades has unequivocally established that asbestos causes lung cancer, mesothelioma and asbestosis wherever asbestos is mined, milled, processed, or applied and that asbestos remains a hazard after it is in place. Through his work with asbestos and other occupational toxins, Dr. Selikoff has greatly advanced our understanding of occupational and environmental exposures in the causation of cancer and chronic lung disease. This research has lead directly to regulation of asbestos, to medical screening programs for early detection of these often fatal diseases, and to development of methods and procedures for recognition, evaluation and control that have served as the models for many other occupational diseases. Thousands of American workers have been helped through this pioneering work.

Mr. President, perhaps Dr. Selikoff's greatest legacy to medicine will be through the hundreds of young physicians he has trained and influenced over his 51-year career at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine. Physicians and worker representatives who have worked with Dr. Selikoff tell me that he embodies all of the finest qualities of a physician. That he is a physician who is dedicated first and foremost to his patients and to the workers whose exposures he worked so hard to control. That he is a physician who is passionate about the need for good science and the use of science to address medical and public health issues. That he is a physician who is compassionate in all of his dealings with his patients and the many thousands of workers he has counseled. That he is a physician who is courageous in confronting the very powerful forces that seek to diminish and discount the importance of occupational and environmental exposures in the causation of disease. And that he is a physician who has been both innovative and tireless in all of these pursuits. It is through example that Dr. Selikoff trained hundreds of young physicians, and influenced thousands more, over a period of two generations. Because of the physician he is, the practice of preventive medicine and occupational medicine is immeasurably richer.

Mr. President, while Dr. Selikoff has made remarkable contributions in the areas of medical research and teaching, it is in the area of public policy that he has had his greatest influence, for he always sought the means to transit and implement his and others' research findings into meaningful public policy. While he was a pioneer in research on the treatment of tuberculosis and the recognition of asbestos-related diseases, his greatest contribution was in formulation and dissemination of his research findings to other scientists and to policymakers. There is little doubt that his extensive work with organized labor made occupational safety and health a critical issue for the working men and women of this country. Organized labor in turn, and with the support of Dr. Selikoff, has greatly influenced passage of all occupational and environmental legislation over the last two decades. Other major contributions Dr. Selikoff has made to public health policy include fathering of two important occupational and environmental health journals and founding two important medical societies. Both of these enterprises greatly promoted the use of scientific communication in for the advancement of science.

Mr. President, largely because of Dr. Selikoff the field of occupational and environmental health has made very significant advances over the last two decades. In recognition of Dr. Selikoff's life's work, the Irving J. Selikoff Foundation for Workers and Environmental Health has been established and the Irving J. Selikoff Asbestos Archives and Research Center is being established at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine. I know many of my colleagues join me in giving tribute and honor to Dr. Selikoff for all that he has done for the Amer-

ican people and in congratulating him on the formation of the Selikoff Foundation and the dedication of the Irving J. Selikoff Asbestos Archives and Research Center which will continue, for the decades to come, his vision and dedication to public health and the health of the American worker.•

IN RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL AGENT PATRICK LEAHEY

• Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Special Agent Patrick Leahey of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms upon his recognition by the Federal Bar Association at their Third Annual Salute to Federal Law Enforcement Officers Luncheon which was held on April 21, 1992.

Agent Leahey is to be highly commended for his extraordinary efforts above and beyond the call of duty. On June 18, 1991, Resident Agent in Charge Pratt and Special Agents Michael Dawkins, John Carr, and Patrick Leahey, found themselves in a shootout initiated by Darryl Mason, a convicted felon who had a history of narcotic trafficking, assault with a deadly weapon, robbery, burglary, and carrying a concealed weapon.

During a surveillance and planned buy/bust, the ATF had planned to execute an outstanding Federal arrest warrant for Mason. All ATF personnel involved in the operation were informed of the intended surveillance of an undercover meeting between a confidential informant and Mason for the purchase of 1 kilogram of rock cocaine.

After the informant made the initial contact, he informed the agents that Mason and the other suspects were getting the drugs and that the deal would proceed momentarily. A short time thereafter, two suspects were observed entering the garage beneath the apartment complex approaching two Mustang convertibles which were parked side by side in the garage. The agents observed Mason open the trunk of one of the vehicles. Fearing that the suspects were going to try to leave the area, the arrest team called for the execution of the Federal arrest warrant on Mason.

As the arrest team entered the garage, they announced "Federal Officers with a warrant" and yelled, "Police, get down!" The other suspect, Victor Pugh, although armed, immediately dropped his weapon and complied with the agents' instruction. Upon entering the garage, they observed that Mason had removed a large weapon from the trunk of his vehicle and began to fire on the agents. Dawkins, who was in the center of the garage, without cover, returned fire with his shotgun. After being bombarded with gunfire, Dawkins sustained a gunshot wound to his foot. He tried to keep moving but fell to the ground as his foot could not longer support him. He dropped his shotgun in the fall but immediately drew his handgun and continued to fire at Mason.

Upon realizing that Dawkins was wounded and still being fired upon, Agents Pratt, Carr, and Leahey, seeking to draw the gunman's attention away from Dawkins, moved their positions and continued to fire upon Mason.

Despite warnings to "freeze and get down," Mason failed to heed the instructions and continued to fire upon the agents. He then turned and fired on Agent Pratt. Pratt responded by firing two rounds from his shotgun, which hit the suspect, causing him to fall to the floor and was immediately handcuffed.

If it were not for the quick response of Agents Pratt, Carr, and Leahey, without concern for their personal safety, it is possible that the gunman could have advanced on the unprotected Agent Dawkins, thereby causing much more serious injuries to the exposed agents.

Mr. President, I would ask that the Members of the Senate join me today in extending our deepest gratitude and highest commendations to Special Agent Leahey upon his receipt of the Federal Bar Association's Medal of Valor for exemplary service above and beyond the call of duty.•

FAREWELL, DR. EUGENE W. SMITH

• Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, Arkansas State University in Jonesboro will bid farewell soon to its eighth president, Dr. Eugene W. Smith. Gene Smith's departure as president caps a 34-year career at ASU.

Eugene Smith is a native of Forrest City, AR, where his father was superintendent of schools for 40 years and his mother was a public school teacher. He received his B.A. degree from Arkansas State in 1952. He pursued and completed his master of education and his doctorate in education from the University of Mississippi, with a stint as a commissioned artillery officer in the Korean conflict between degrees.

He came to Arkansas State University in 1958 and has served that fine institution in my State in a number of capacities. He has been instructor, associate professor, and professor of education; he also has administered ASU's graduate programs. From 1959–69, Eugene served as executive assistant to the president. He became vice president for administration in 1969 and then was named dean of the graduate school in 1971. He became senior vice president in 1980.

Gene Smith was installed as ASU's eighth president on February 15, 1984. He has led Arkansas State through some of its finest years.

Though presiding over a university is a full-time job, Gene Smith has also found time to be a force in his local community. He is president of the Jonesboro Industrial Development Corp. and in 1983 was named Arkansas' Volunteer Industrial Developer of the Year. He serves on the Arkansas State Council for Economic Development and was appointed by Gov. Bill Clinton to serve on the State Committee for Employer Support of the National Guard and Reserve.

A past member of the City Council of Jonesboro and an active member of the Greater Jonesboro Chamber of Commerce, including stints as vice president and president, Gene is also a member of Rotary International and numerous academic fraternities.

Mr. President, this man's energy is never ending. He runs a major university, is active in all the major pursuits of his local community, and is a devoted husband and father.

Dr. Eugene Smith has devoted his life to the pursuit of higher education in Arkansas. We owe him a debt of gratitude. He has attained a well-deserved retirement the old fashioned way—he earned it.

I am proud to call Gene Smith my friend. I wish he and Ann a long and relaxing retirement.•

THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES BROADCAST

• Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, as employers and State and local agencies move to implement the Americans With Disabilities Act, the most sweeping legislation ever to provide greater access to persons with disabilities, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the fine achievements and outstanding community service of a local radio and talk show in Bangor, ME.

"The Americans With Disabilities Broadcast," aired on Maine Talk Radio and Bangor Cablevision Channel 36, has been providing an invaluable service to Mainers for the past 2 years. The show, staffed and run by persons with mental health and physical disabilities, has supported those with disabilities through an insightful format. The program offers current and useful information about support systems available to its listeners and works to shatter the stigma too commonly associated with persons with disabilities. The program addresses such issues as alcohol and drug abuse, mental illness, blindness, and other physical disabilities.

Recently, the program was recognized by President and Mrs. Bush and has been getting international attention due to its innovative approach.

I am sure that my colleagues will agree that "The Americans With Disabilities Broadcast" program serves as a national model. Through education, this program combats discrimination and tears down misperceptions that are all too often the greatest obstacle to persons with disabilities. I commend

their work and wish them continued success as they inspire and educate their audiences.

The article follows:

[From the Bangor Daily News, Feb. 24, 1992]

BANGOR TALK SHOW A RESOURCE FOR DISABLED

(By Nancy Garland)

A Bangor radio talk show known as a resource of information for people interested in mental-health or substance-abuse issues may have its format adopted in the international radio circuit, according to Jeff Hamm, the program's creator.

The "Americans With Disabilities Broadcast" airs at 8:05 a.m. Saturdays on Maine Talk Radio (AM 620). It is a program with a unique twist because it is put together by about 12 clients with mental-health problems who research the topics and talk on the air about various issues.

The issues range from advice on prostheses—artificial arms, legs or other body parts—to the problems of people who have the disease of alcoholism or drug addiction.

The talk show also airs at 5:30 p.m. Tuesdays and Thursdays on Bangor Cablevision Channel 36. It also has featured national experts who have talked on the problems of dual diagnosis clients—people who have both mental illness and alcoholism or drug addiction.

Chuck Harmon, spokesman for the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, has talked about the stigma of mental illness in American society.

In its second year, the show, once aired on college radio stations in Bangor and Orono, switched to commercial radio about five months ago to reach a wider audience. It also expanded its format to include substance abuse problems, according to Hamm, the program's host.

Hamm also is president of the Radio Mental Health Corp., a local organization that was the show's original sponsor.

The program has gained some high-level attention in recent months. President George Bush and first lady Barbara Bush wrote a letter to congratulate Hamm and the staff on their efforts. Some Canadian and Belgian broadcasters have questioned Hamm about using the program's format in their respective countries.

President Bush's signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act last summer gave the program a new lease on life, according to Hamm.

The disabilities act is important because it will improve the lives of handicapped people. It also will provide the backdrop for future programming and community activities for the local radio and its staff, Hamm said.

Hamm and friends are working to make the physical setting at their radio station more accessible to handicapped people.

According to Hamm, plans are under way to provide the station with a ramp to enhance access for disabled and wheelchair-bound people. The ramp completion may be marked with a local parade, a ribbon-cutting ceremony, and a national broadcast by satellite of the disabilities-issues program, Hamm said.

Future plans are exciting, but Hamm said it's important to keep focused on the important service the program provides.

"We need to inform people on issues surrounding disabilities. People need to know what support systems are out there for them," said Hamm.

The program also tries to project the human side of being disabled, Hamm said. Disabled people "don't want to be hand held," said Hamm. "They want an opportunity to work, to be loved, to be viewed as normal human beings."

The station was formerly owned by writer Stephen King under the call letters WZON.●

THE 100-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF CONGREGATION B'NAI DAVID

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise in commemoration of the May 1992 centennial anniversary of the establishment of Congregation B'nai David of Southfield, MI. For 100 years, this synagogue has served as a center of faith for the Jewish community of southeast Michigan.

At this special time, I pay tribute to the first congregation leaders who worked so diligently to create this place of worship. With a devotion to G-d and a true belief in the importance of preserving and safeguarding Jewish culture and heritage, the founders of B'nai David labored to establish this historic religious center. At the same time, they assured that the synagogue would exist for use by succeeding generations of their community.

The membership of Congregation B'nai David has contributed profoundly to the well-being of Michigan and continues to give generously of itself. As a testament to this reality, many of its members are community leaders in fields such as education, business, government, and social work and have given generously of their time and resources to community endeavors. The congregation has been heavily involved in encouraging understanding among different ethnic and religious groups in the Detroit metropolitan area and participates in numerous philanthropic activities to promote social responsibility.

I offer the entire membership of Congregation B'nai David my best wishes for the future. Through B'nai David's commitment to the Jewish faith and its dedication to the community, I am sure that the synagogue will exist as a citadel of inspiration for at least another 100 years.●

THE UNNECESSARY NEED OF THE MEDIA FOR SELF-FLAGELLATION

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, what is this need the media has for self-doubt, for self-flagellation? Every American victory is buried in criticism, every initiative buffeted by second-guessing. "Gulf War Failures Cited," a Washington Post story that appeared on April 11, 1992, stands as a glaring, but hardly unique, example.

As anyone who has even glanced at the thousands of pages of the report, "Conduct of the Persian Gulf War," knows, it is hardly an exercise in handwringing over failures. The coalition wrought unprecedented havoc, and suffered extraordinarily few casualties. The gist of the report parallels impressions of the time: That our equipment worked better than our wildest expectations, that our troops are the best trained in the world, and that our tactics were vastly superior to that of our opponents. If confirms that the "treasure for blood" tradeoff the American public has always insisted on was the right one.

The Post saw things differently. The passage that caught my eye, and prompted this statement, was the following:

> The Pentagon's acknowledgement of severe unintended damage contradicted previous official assertions that 43 days of intensive bombing had spared the generators, and renewed questions of responsibility for thousands of civilian postwar deaths.

Renewed questions of responsibility? What questions? Does the Washington Post not know who is responsible? I will tell you who is responsible for Iraqi civilian casualties: Saddam Hussein. Not President Bush, not General Schwarzkopf, not the Air Force, not Captain So-and-So or Commander Such-and-Such, but Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein is also responsible for butchering his own Kurdish and Shiite populations, killing Kuwaiti and Israeli civilians, all coalition losses, whether in combat or in accidents, and even the decimation of his own military.

Saddam Hussein is a monster who shot his way into power, launched an 8-year war that was little more than a meat grinder, gassed Kurdish civilians, and raped Kuwait. The deaths, the sorrow, the misery, that each of these actions caused is his responsibility, and his alone. Yet, the media goes into tortured convolutions to lay the blame squarely at our own door.

Desert Storm has been over for more than a year, and yet the press is still finger-pointing over misguided diplomacy, friendly fire, and weapons gone awry. And, admittedly, I am embarrassed to say that, for political reasons, Congress and the administration have only added fuel to the fire.

There is something sick going on, something very neurotic about all this self-abuse. Was the war perfect? No. Were mistakes made? Yes. But where is the balance? Where's the reason? Why is it that, no matter what the issue, the 90 percent that goes right is ignored, and the 10 percent that goes wrong is trumpeted with almost perverse glee? People have lost faith in education, in the police, in government, in labor, in everything, and when I read what I read, and I see what I see, in the news, I do not wonder why.●

IN RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL AGENT MICHAEL DAWKINS

● Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Special Agent Michael Dawkins of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms upon his

recognition by the Federal Bar Association at their Third Annual Salute to Federal Law Enforcement Officers Luncheon which was held on April 21, 1992.

Agent Dawkins is to be highly commended for his extraordinary efforts above and beyond the call of duty. On June 18, 1991, Resident Agent in Charge Pratt and Special Agents Michael Dawkins, John Carr, and Patrick Leahey, found themselves in a shootout initiated by Darryl Mason, a convicted felon who had a history of narcotic trafficking, assault with a deadly weapon, robbery, burglary, and carrying a concealed weapon.

During a surveillance and planned buy/bust, the ATF had planned to execute an outstanding Federal arrest warrant for Mason. All ATF personnel involved in the operation were informed of the intended surveillance of an undercover meeting between a confidential informant and Mason for the purchase of one kilogram of rock cocaine.

After the informant made the initial contact, he informed the agents that Mason and the other suspects were getting the drugs and that the deal would proceed momentarily. A short time thereafter, two suspects were observed entering the garage beneath the apartment complex approaching two Mustang convertibles which were parked side by side in the garage. The agents observed Mason open the trunk of one of the vehicles. Fearing that the suspects were going to try to leave the area, the arrest team called for the execution of the Federal arrest warrant on Mason.

As the arrest team entered the garage, they announced "Federal officers with a warrant" and yelled, "Police, get down!" The other suspect, Victor Pugh, although armed, immediately dropped his weapon and complied with the agents' instruction. Upon entering the garage, they observed that Mason had removed a large weapon from the trunk of his vehicle and began to fire on the agents. Dawkins, who was in the center of the garage, without cover, returned fire with his shotgun. After being bombarded with gunfire, Dawkins sustained a gunshot wound to his foot. He tried to keep moving but fell to the ground as his foot could no longer support him. He dropped his shotgun in the fall but immediately drew his handgun and continued to fire at Mason.

Upon realizing that Dawkins was wounded and still being fired upon, Agents Pratt, Carr, and Leahey, seeking to draw the gunman's attention away from Dawkins, moved their positions and continued to fire upon Mason.

Despite warnings to "freeze and get down," Mason failed to heed the instructions and continued to fire upon the agents. He then turned and fired on Agent Pratt. Pratt responded by firing two rounds from his shotgun, which hit the suspect, causing him to fall to the floor and he was immediately handcuffed.

If it were not for the quick response of Agents Pratt, Carr, and Leahy, without concern for their personal safety, it is possible that the gunman could have advanced on the unprotected Agent Dawkins, thereby causing much more serious injuries to the exposed agents.

Mr. President, I would ask that the Members of the Senate join me today in extending our deepest gratitude and highest commendations to Special Agent Dawkins upon his receipt of the Federal Bar Association's Medal of Valor for exemplary service above and beyond the call of duty.●

DEDICATION OF THE HOWARD R. SWEARER CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE AT BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE, RI

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on April 10 the Brown University community honored Dr. Howard R. Swearer, a former Brown University president who passed away last year, by dedicating the Howard R. Swearer Center for Public Service on the university's campus. I was invited to participate in the dedication ceremonies. Unfortunately, the Senate continued its debate on the budget resolution into the late afternoon, and I was unable to attend. I would like to take a moment now to deliver the remarks I prepared for that evening.

When I was invited to speak, I began to think about the principles upon which the Brown University was founded. The original incentive was the desire to perpetuate an educated ministry, but the broader purpose was declared in the charter of 1764 as, "* * * preserving in the community a succession of men, duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation."

What makes a person duly qualified? Of course, there are tangible qualifications—the classes one takes, the degree one receives, and the academic honors one may achieve.

Beyond that, though, are the intangibles—respect for oneself and others, and a sense of civic responsibility causing one to reach out to the community and to assist those who may be less fortunate.

Howard Swearer personified these qualities, and was a role model as a public servant. His career included working with the first Peace Corps group that went to Africa and South America, a year as an American Political Science Association congressional fellow, and a number of community and public advocacy organizations in Rhode Island.

During his presidency at Brown, Howard worked to promote a greater understanding between people of different cultures and backgrounds. He expanded Brown's international studies and student exchange programs, an effort reflecting Howard's academic specialty in the politics of the Soviet Union. Howard also was deeply devoted to diversifying the university's student body.

Howard believed that an undergraduate education should include learning the practice of citizenship through personal efforts to improve the lives of others. And by establishing the Center for Public Service in 1987 and forming the campus compact, Howard helped renew an ethic of public service in students at Brown and at universities across the country.

At one time, public servants were held in high regard by their fellow citizens. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be the case today. The young people involved with the Swearer Center and the recipients of the Swearer scholarships, by their example of excellence and their commitment to serving their communities, are just what is needed to bring about a renewal of trust and confidence in public figures.

I do hope, and I believe it was also Howard's dream, that many of them will consider running for public office within our city, State, or Federal Government. That certainly would be a splendid way to honor Howard and his efforts to perpetuate the invaluable traditions of volunteerism and community service.

Those who come through the center will, I am confident, proceed to discharge their, "offices of life with usefulness and reputation."●

CHANGE IN STATUS AND CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SERVICE OF CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 446, S. 2569, a bill to provide for certain military promotions; that the bill be deemed read for the third time; passed; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2569) to amend title 10, United States Code, to make the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to provide joint duty credit for certain service; and to provide for the temporary continuation of the current Deputy National Security Adviser in a flag officer grade in the Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S. 2569

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF.

(a) DESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF.—Section 151(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

"(2) The Vice Chairman.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 154 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking out "such" and inserting in lieu thereof "the duties prescribed for him as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and such other";

(B) by striking out subsection (f); and

(C) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(2) Section 155(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking out "and the Vice Chairman."

SEC. 2. JOINT DUTY CREDIT FOR EQUIVALENT DUTY IN OPERATIONS DESERT SHIELD AND DESERT STORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, upon a recommendation made in accordance with paragraph (3), shall credit an officer of the Armed Forces of the United States who has completed service described in paragraph (2) as having completed a full tour of duty in a joint duty assignment for the purposes of chapter 38 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies to any officer who, after August 1, 1990, and before October 1, 1991, performed service in an assignment in the Persian Gulf combat zone that—

(A) provided significant experience in joint matters; or

(B) involved frequent professional interaction of that officer with (i) units and members of any of the armed forces other than the officer's armed force, or (ii) an allied armed force.

(3) The Secretary shall take action under paragraph (1) in the case of any officer if that action is recommended, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by the Chief of Staff of the Army (for an officer in the Army), the Chief of Naval Operations (for an officer in the Navy), the Chief of Staff of the Air Force (for an officer in the Air Force), or the Commandant of the Marine Corps (for an officer in the Marine Corps).

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN REPORTING AND POLICY REQUIREMENTS.—Officers for whom joint duty credit has been granted pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be counted for the purposes of paragraphs (7), (8), (9), (11), or (12) of section 667 of title 10, United States Code, and subsections (a)(3) and (b) of section 662 of such title.

(c) INFORMATION ON EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY TO BE INCLUDED IN FISCAL YEAR 1993 ANNUAL REPORT.—The annual report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 1993 under section 113(c) of title 10, United States Code, shall include the following information:

(1) The total number of officers granted joint duty credit pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) The total number of such officers for each armed force.

(3) The total number of officers in each grade and each occupational specialty who have been granted joint duty credit pursuant to subsection (a).

(4) For each armed force, the total number of such officers in each grade and each occupational specialty who have been granted such credit.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "joint matters" has the meaning given such term in section 668(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term "Persian Gulf combat zone" means the area designated by the President as the combat zone for Operation Desert Shield, Operation Desert Storm, and related operations for purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 3. GRADE OF THE CURRENT DEPUTY NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR WHILE PENDING RETIREMENT IN THE NAVY.

(a) TEMPORARY CONTINUATION IN GRADE.—Notwithstanding the period of limitation contained in section 601(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, the person who began service in the position of Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy for National Security Affairs on December 5, 1991, shall continue to hold the grade of admiral while awaiting retirement in the Navy, except that such person may not continue to hold that grade under the authority of this section after the earlier of—

(1) the date on which he terminates service in that position; or

(2) June 4, 1992.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect as of December 5, 1991.

ORDERS FOR APRIL 29 AND APRIL 30, 1992

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 29; that following the prayer, the Journal of Proceedings be deemed approved to date, and that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there be a period for morning business, not to extend beyond 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each; that during morning business there be a total of 75 minutes under the control of Senators KERRY and SMITH; that Senators MACK, DOLE, and METZENBAUM be recognized for up to 15 minutes each; Senator GRAMM for up to 10 minutes and Senator LEVIN for up to 5 minutes; that at 12 noon, the Senate resume consideration of S. 3, the Senate Election Ethics Act conference report; that when the Senate completes its business on Wednesday, April 29, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, April 30; that following the prayer, the Journal of Proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business, not to extend beyond 10:40 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each; with the time from 9:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m., under the control of the majority leader or his designee; that at 10:40 a.m., Thursday, the Senate stand in recess until 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 29, 1992.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:50 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, April 29, 1992, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28, 1992:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DENNIS P. BARRETT, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF MADAGASCAR.

RICHARD GOODWIN CAPEN, JR., OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SPAIN.

ROGER A. MCGUIRE, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA-BISSAU.

WILLIAM LACY SWING, OF NORTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA.

WILLIAM CLARK, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE RICHARD H. SOLOMON.

JAMES P. COVEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS. (NEW POSITION)

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

JAMES THOMAS GRADY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 1994. (REAPPOINTMENT)

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

PAMELA J. TURNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 1995. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JAMES D. JAMESON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE TIMOTHY JOHN MCBRIDE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

CLARENCE H. ALBRIGHT, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE FRANCIS ANTHONY KEATING II.

THE JUDICIARY

NATHANIEL M. GORTON, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS VICE A NEW POSITION CREATED BY PUBLIC LAW 101-650, APPROVED DECEMBER 1, 1990.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

STEVEN MANASTER, OF UTAH, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 1997, VICE FOWLER C. WEST, TERM EXPIRING.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

TONY ARMENDARIZ, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF 5 YEARS EXPIRING JULY 29, 1997. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

PHILIP BRUNELLE, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 1994, VICE PHYLLIS CURTIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LINDA GILLESPIE STUNTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF ENERGY, VICE W. HENSON MOORE.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

G. KIM WINCUP, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE JOHN J. WELCH, JR.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL:

FRED S. GOLOVE GEORGE R. MERRILEES

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF):

ROBERT E. SLONCEN

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREWITH:

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ANNE H. AARNES, OF WASHINGTON
CURTIS W. CHRISTENSEN, OF MARYLAND
ALFRED M. CLAVELLI, OF NEVADA
MICHAEL S. GOULD, OF NEW JERSEY
LINDA RAE GREGORY, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT PAUL MATHIA, OF FLORIDA
LOUIS MUNDY III, OF FLORIDA
WILLARD J. PEARSON, JR., OF INDIANA
DONALD L. PRESSLEY, OF VIRGINIA
HOWARD J. SUMKA, OF MARYLAND

FOR REAPPOINTMENT IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM A. EATON, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

STEPHEN K. CRAVEN, OF NORTH CAROLINA

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

HILDA MARIE ARELLANO, OF TEXAS
THOMAS C. ASMUS, OF TEXAS
GERALD ANTHONY CASHION, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES R. CUMMISKEY, OF MARYLAND
ANTHONY NICHOLAS DELEO, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CORWIN VANE EDWARDS, JR., OF MARYLAND
TIMOTHY J. FRANCHOIS, OF VIRGINIA
RODGER D. GARNER, OF OREGON
H. PAUL GREENOUGH, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID HUNTER STOCKTON HOELSCHER, OF MARYLAND
JAMES L. JARRELL, OF OHIO
DREW WILLIAM LUTEN III, OF MISSOURI
ALFRED NAKATSUMA-VACA, OF CALIFORNIA
ROBERT LEONARD GEORGE O'LEARY, OF VIRGINIA
SALLY JO PATTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SANATH KUMAR REDDY, OF ALABAMA
CURTIS A. REINTSMA, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN WAYNE SCHAMPER, OF NEVADA
MARILYNN ANN SCHMIDT, OF VIRGINIA

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

LARRY A. MOODY, OF CALIFORNIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LEANNE HOGIE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
ALAN HRAPSKY, OF MICHIGAN
ROSS KREAMER, OF KENTUCKY
S. ROD MCSHERRY, OF NEW MEXICO
WAYNE MOLSTAD, OF WISCONSIN
EUGENE PHILHOWER, OF NEW JERSEY
JOHN B. REYNOLDS, OF KENTUCKY
SCOTT R. REYNOLDS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
LAURA SCANDURRA, OF VIRGINIA

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MARY BETH ALLEN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
HAWTHORNE AIDA MATEO ANGELES, OF VIRGINIA
DENISE A. AWAD, OF PENNSYLVANIA
FELIX N. AWANTANG, OF MARYLAND
TERRY G. BASKIN, OF NEVADA
CAROL R. BECKER, OF CALIFORNIA
DAN WILLIAM BLUMHAGEN, OF WASHINGTON
ALFREDA MAE BREWER, OF OHIO
PAULA J. BRYAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ALBERT L. CATES, OF NEW MEXICO
ENRIQUE FRANCISCO CELAYA, OF FLORIDA
SUSAN A. CLAY, OF VIRGINIA
TULLY R. CORNICK, V, OF NEW YORK
CHARLES J. CRANE, OF NEW MEXICO
SHARON L. CROMER, OF NEW YORK
GERARD M. CUSTER, OF NEVADA
KIRK M. DAHLGREN, OF CALIFORNIA
DULAL C. DATTA, OF TEXAS
PAUL DAVIS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
CARL BRANDON DERRICK, OF FLORIDA
ALEXANDER DICKIE IV, OF TEXAS
BRENDA A. DOE, OF MINNESOTA
VIRGULINO L. DUARTE, OF MAINE
JIMMY D. DUVALL, OF LOUISIANA
PATRICK CHILION FINE, OF NEW YORK
JANA P. CONSON, OF CALIFORNIA
RICHARD S. GREENE, OF CALIFORNIA
S. ELAINE GRIGSBY-ARNADE, OF FLORIDA
SHANKAR GUPTA, OF MARYLAND
MATHIAS MUZA GWESHE, OF FLORIDA
KAREN LOUISE RUFFING HILLIARD, OF FLORIDA
NANCY L. HOFFMAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENELOPE L. HONG, OF TEXAS
NANCY L. HOOFF, OF WEST VIRGINIA
CLAIRE J. JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA
PATRICIA L. JORDAN, OF OHIO
YASHWANT KAINTH, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN L. KATT, JR., OF FLORIDA
SHERYL KELLER, OF CONNECTICUT
ROBERT KIRK, OF INDIANA
S. PETER KLOSKY IV, OF FLORIDA
BARBARA JEANNE KRELL, OF LOUISIANA
RICHARD A. LAWRENCE, OF MARYLAND
JON DANIEL LINDBORG, OF INDIANA
JAMES M. LOCASTE, OF TEXAS
DAVID J. LOSK, OF CALIFORNIA
CECILY L. MANGO, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
WILLIAM B. MARTIN, OF FLORIDA
TEJ S. MATHUR, OF CALIFORNIA
DELBERT N. MCCLUSKEY, OF OREGON
CHRISTOPHER MCDERMOTT, OF MAINE
KATHLEEN S. MCDONALD, OF WISCONSIN
RAYMOND HEROLD MORTON, OF VIRGINIA
RANDALL G. PETERSON, OF WISCONSIN
LEONEL T. PIZARRO, OF CALIFORNIA
IQBAL QAZI, OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS Y. QUAN, JR., OF TEXAS
R. THOMAS RAY, OF NEW YORK
RAY R. REDDY, OF CALIFORNIA
RAYMOND Z.H. RENFRO, OF OKLAHOMA
KURT A. ROCKEMAN, OF MONTANA
DENISE ANNETTE ROLLINS, OF MICHIGAN
DAVID H.A. SCHRODER, OF MISSOURI
MARY P. SELVAGGIO, OF ILLINOIS
CARINA L. STOVER, OF CALIFORNIA
DAWN A. THOMAS, OF NEW YORK
GARY W. VANDERHOOF, OF CALIFORNIA
DANA MARIE VOGEL, OF CALIFORNIA
ELZADIA WASHINGTON, OF ARKANSAS
LEON STEPHEN WASKIN, JR., OF MICHIGAN
LINDA D. WHITLOCK, OF NEW YORK
JOSEPH CRAWFORD WILLIAMS, OF TENNESSEE
SARAH W. WINES, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL LOUIS WISE, OF WEST VIRGINIA
RICHARD J. WOMACK, OF WASHINGTON
ANDREA J. YATES, OF FLORIDA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERT A. ARMSTRONG, OF KANSAS
DANIEL P. BELLEGARDE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
GREGORY DEAN CHAPMAN, OF GEORGIA
EDWARD JOHN FENDLEY, OF ILLINOIS
LAWRENCE J. GUMBINER, OF CALIFORNIA
RUSSELL J. HANKS, OF NEW MEXICO
ROBERT F. HANNAN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS
THOMAS J. HUSHEK, OF WISCONSIN
KATHERINE MARIE INGMANSON, OF WASHINGTON
KAREN ELIZABETH JOHNSON, OF TEXAS
JAMES MARX LEVY, OF WASHINGTON
PHILIP N. LOHRE, OF COLORADO
MARTHA L. MELZOW, OF CALIFORNIA
WILLIAM F. MOONEY, OF MARYLAND
R. BRUCE NEULING, OF CALIFORNIA
LAWRENCE PATTERSON NOYES, OF NEW JERSEY
JOHN OLSON, OF CALIFORNIA
BLOSSOM N. S. PERRY, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD G. ROSENMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
PHILIP NYE SUTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LESLIE BERGER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

DANIEL THOMPSON, OF CALIFORNIA

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

WILLIAM HINTON COOK, OF TENNESSEE
JOHN ANDREW CORTEZ-GREIG, OF CALIFORNIA
SOPHIE L. FOLLY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JENNIFER ZIMDAHL GALT, OF COLORADO
OLIVIA P. L. HILTON, OF NEW YORK
KELLY ANN KEIDERLING, OF CALIFORNIA
BARTON WILLIAM MARCOIS, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER MIDURA, OF TENNESSEE
CHRISTOPHER F. SCHARF, OF NEW YORK
KENNEY LECHMAN VEAL, OF MISSOURI
VIVIAN S. WALKER, OF CALIFORNIA
STACY E. WHITE, OF TEXAS
ROBERT ANTHONY WOOD, OF NEW YORK

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND COMMERCE AND THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED:

CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

C. PATRICIA ALSUP, OF FLORIDA
KENNETH R. ANDERSON, OF VIRGINIA
SANDRA L. ASHBY, OF VIRGINIA
DEBORAH A. BARIBEAU, OF VIRGINIA
ANTONIA JOY BARRY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PAMELA MARIE BATES, OF OHIO
ROBERT A. BAXTER, OF VIRGINIA
DON J. BENNETT, OF VIRGINIA
MARCIA PATRICIA BOSSHARDT, OF TEXAS
LAURA A. BUCKWALD, OF VIRGINIA
DEBORAH M. CARNEY, OF VIRGINIA
THEODORE E. CARRICK, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL S. CATT, OF OHIO
MARK A. CAUDILL, OF VIRGINIA
MARK DANIEL CLARK, OF ARIZONA
STEVEN COATS, OF ILLINOIS
DAVID C. CONNELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANA CORONA, OF VIRGINIA
GINA M. CORTESELLI, OF VIRGINIA
KATHLEEN L. CUNNINGHAM, OF IOWA
ELINOR ANN DE MENDONCA, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL DETAR, OF NEW YORK
RODGER JAN DEUERLEIN, OF CALIFORNIA
DANIEL A. DONZE, OF ARIZONA
WILLIAM HUIE DUNCAN, OF MARYLAND
BRADLEY JAMES DUNN, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT L. EDER, OF FLORIDA
DIANE M. EGAN, OF VIRGINIA
MARK CHRISTOPHER ELLIOTT, OF MARYLAND
JESSICA ELLIS, OF WASHINGTON
KIMBERLY K. EVERETT, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA G. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS F. FORT, OF VIRGINIA
JERRY J. FOTHERINGILL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELEANORE M. FOX, OF CALIFORNIA
SUSAN H. FROST, OF NORTH CAROLINA
GREGORY D.S. FUKUTOMI, OF NEW YORK
SANDRA HAMILTON GAYTON, OF ARIZONA
MARY F. GERARD, OF CALIFORNIA
JOANNE L. GIESS, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA ELIZA GONZALES, OF TEXAS
STEFAN GRANITO, OF FLORIDA
PETER X. HARDING, OF MASSACHUSETTS
SUSAN HEBERT-CLEARY, OF NEW YORK
GARY RUSSELL HOBIN, OF GEORGIA
JAMIE P. HORSLEY, OF CALIFORNIA
RANDALL WARREN HOUSTON, OF CALIFORNIA
RICHARD W. HUCKABY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLLEEN ELIZABETH HYLAND, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JILL JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA
LESLIE A. JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
MARGARET F. JUDY, OF MARYLAND
TIMOTHY B. KANE, OF VIRGINIA
DIANE M. KAUFFMANN, OF VIRGINIA
COLLEEN M. KEELEY, OF VIRGINIA
LISA C. KENNEDY, OF CALIFORNIA
GREGORY S. KEOUGH, OF MARYLAND
ERIC R. KETTNER, OF WISCONSIN
ALLEN H. KUPETZ, OF TEXAS
FREDERICK B. KURTZ, OF NEW JERSEY
RANDALL J. LABOUNTY, OF MISSOURI
BRIAN LIEKE, OF TEXAS
NICOLE LISE, OF NEW YORK
CAROLINE B. MANGELSDORF, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID H. MARTINEZ, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES M. MCCARTHY, OF MARYLAND
BRIAN F. MCCAULEY, OF VIRGINIA
FRED C. MCKINNEY, OF VIRGINIA
KATHLEEN M. MCQUAID, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID SLAYTON MEALE, OF VIRGINIA
REGINALD A. MILLER, OF CALIFORNIA
STEPHEN H. MILLER, OF MARYLAND
THOMAS E. MOORE, OF TEXAS
ROBERT M. MURPHY, OF WASHINGTON
DONALD E. MUTH, OF VIRGINIA
ROSALEEN A. O'TOOLE, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES M. PEREZ, OF FLORIDA
PETER G. PINESS, OF VIRGINIA
MIRA PIPLANI, OF VIRGINIA
SARA ELLEN POTTER, OF VIRGINIA
EMILIA A. PUMA, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JAMES E. REESE, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD T. REITER, OF CALIFORNIA
JOHN D. RUBIO, OF PUERTO RICO
SUSAN LAURA RUFFO, OF WASHINGTON
JULIE ANN RUTERBORIES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HEIDI ANNE SCHARADIN, OF INDIANA
ALBERT C. SCHULTZ, OF INDIANA
MILLICENT H. SCHWENK, OF VIRGINIA
LARRY G. SEALS, OF VIRGINIA
KENT C. SHIGETOMI, OF WASHINGTON
LILLIAN A. STEELE, OF CALIFORNIA
GREGORY D. STOLP, OF VIRGINIA
MARGARET L. TAMS, OF COLORADO
LISA L. TEPPER, OF CALIFORNIA
KENNETH A. THOMAS, OF OREGON
KATHERINE VAN DE VATE, OF NEW JERSEY
ROBERT C. WARD, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA A. WELCH, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER K. WESTON, OF VIRGINIA
WENDY FLEMING WHEELER, OF WASHINGTON
LYNN MARIE WHITLOCK, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOCK WHITTLESEY, OF FLORIDA
KAREN L. WILLIAMS, OF MISSOURI

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSON OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, PREVIOUSLY APPOINTED AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, A CONSULAR OFFI-

CER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA MAY 15, 1989, NOW TO BE EFFECTIVE APRIL 28, 1988.

DANIEL RICHARD RUSSEL, OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be general

GEN. DONALD J. KUTYNA, xxx-xx-xx... U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. CHARLES A. HORNER, xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. VERNON J. KONDRA, xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. CLIFFORD H. REES, JR. xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL A. NELSON, xxx-xx-xx... U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT L. RUTHERFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MALCOLM B. ARMSTRONG, xxx-xx-xx... U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BUSTER C. GLOSSON, xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES L. JAMERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ARLEN D. JAMESON, xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WALTER KROSS, xxx-xx-xx... U.S. AIR FORCE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be general

GEN. JOHN R. GALVIN, xxx-xx-xx... U.S. ARMY.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601, FOR REASSIGNMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY AS FOLLOWS:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. HENRY C. STACKPOLE, III, xxx-xx-xx... USMC.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601, FOR ASSIGNMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY AS FOLLOWS:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. NORMAN E. EHLERT, xxx-xx-xx... USMC.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 601 AND 5035:

To be Vice Chief of Naval Operations

To be admiral

VICE ADM. STANLEY R. ARTHUR, U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-xx...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. HENRY H. MAUZ, JR., U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-xx...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JERRY O. TUTTLE, U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JERRY L. UNRUH, U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-xx...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. EDWARD M. STRAW, SUPPLY CORPS, U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TIMOTHY W. WRIGHT, U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (SELECTEE) JOSEPH W. PRUEHER, U.S. NAVY, xxx-xx-...

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 8067, TO PERFORM DUTIES INDICATED WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN A HIGHER GRADE THAN THAT INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

ROBERT T. KINDLEY xxx-xx-x...
CARLOS A. LAVARREDA xxx-xx-x...

To be major

EDWIN C. TELFER xxx-xx-x...

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

DAVID R. COOLEY xxx-xx-x...
JAMES M. DUNBAR xxx-xx-x...
ALAN L. FAHNDRICH xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY M. FRANK xxx-xx-x...
DONALD P. GIBSON xxx-xx-x...
JOHN W. HOFMAN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN S. HORNBURG xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS W. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x...
TODD A. SNEESBY xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL D. ZOLLARS xxx-xx-x...

To be major

CHARLES H. DEAN, JR. xxx-xx-xx...
PAUL W. HAAG xxx-xx-x...
JUDITH G. HILL xxx-xx-x...
GLORIA J. HOBAN xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD E. RUTLEDGE xxx-xx-x...
PHILLIP R. SANDEFUR xxx-xx-xx...

To be captain

DIANE J. FLINT xxx-xx-xx...
TIMOTHY J. HALLIGAN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL A. MOSUR xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT AS RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, IN GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITES STATES CODE, SECTION 593, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 8067, TO PERFORM THE DUTIES INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ANTONIO P. CABREIRA xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD J. FALESKI xxx-xx-xx...
ROBERT J. GRANT xxx-xx-xx...
EDWARD I. MELTON, JR. xxx-xx-x...
JOHN T. NUCKOLS xxx-xx-x...
WEN HAN. TSUNG xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH W. WOLFE xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING AIR FORCE OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624 AND 1552, WITH DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be major

MARILYN P. MARTINETTO xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. PATRICK xxx-xx-x...

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK ARE ALSO BEING NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

ARMY

To be lieutenant colonel

FRANCISCO B. IRIARTE xxx-xx-x...

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL R. MCMILLION xxx-xx-x...

ARMY

To be major

*JAMES M. GORHAM xxx-xx-xxxx
DUNCAN M. LANG xxx-xx-x...

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

To be major

*ALETHA H. BARNETT-FRIEDEL xxx-xx-xx...
*DANIEL L. HOSSBACH xxx-xx-x...

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 593(A), 594 AND 3353:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

DAVITT, WILLIAM F., III xxx-xx-xx...
JOHNSTONE, ROBERT E. xxx-xx-x...
MULCHIN, NICK J. xxx-xx-x...
PERNICE, CHARLES A. xxx-xx-x...
PISARELLO, JUAN C. xxx-xx-xx...
ROSS, HERBERT E. xxx-xx-xx...
SNEAD, JOSEPH A. xxx-xx-xx...

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED REGULAR OFFICER TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5582(A):

To be lieutenant

DAVIS, WILLIAM K.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LINE OFFICERS TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5582(B):

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

COYLE, PHILIP L.
LAMONT, DONALD J.
STCLAIR, JOHN H.
HOFMEISTER, ERIC R.
LEE, TODD R.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LINE OFFICERS TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5582(B):

To be ensign

CONE, MICHAEL J.
HARAN, GERALD B., JR.
SMALLWOOD, MACEO L.
GRAULICH, DAVID G.
HUNTER, EDWARD S.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LINE OFFICER TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT IN THE CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5582(B):

To be lieutenant

ARROYO, ERICK A.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LINE OFFICERS TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE) IN THE CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5582(B):

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

KNIGHT, JOHN A.
STAUNTON, DOUGLAS A.
LEWIS, BRIAN J.
YORK, SAMUEL R.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LINE OFFICERS TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5582(B):

To be ensign

MCCUTCHEN, DOUGLAS E.
WILLMORE, CHARLES S.
SHELDON, GERALD E.
WYDAJEWSKI, KENNETH J.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

To be major

MARK S. *. ACKERMAN, xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD J. *. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-x...
DONNA L. *. BARLETT, xxx-xx-xx...
FRIEDEL A. *. BARNETT, xxx-xx-xx...
WILLIAM T. *. BARTO, xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD E. *. BEAUCHAMP, xxx-xx-x...
NICHOLAS *. BETSACON, xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL C. *. BOBRICK, xxx-xx-x...
ALAN M. *. BOYD, xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY L. *. CADDELL, xxx-xx-xx...
JAMES P. CALVE, xxx-xx-xx...
*. CASTIGLIONECATALDO, xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN E. *. CASTLEN, xxx-xx-xx...
MEREDITH *. CHARBULA, xxx-xx-x...
AMAURY *. COLONBURGOS, xxx-xx-x...
MARK *. CREMIN, xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. DAVIDSON, xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY J. *. DELFUOCO, xxx-xx-xx...
KENT D. *. DUNCAN, xxx-xx-x...
ANNE *. EHRSAMHOLLAND, xxx-xx-x...
MAX W. *. ERICKSON, xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE A. *. FIGURSKI, xxx-xx-x...
RAFE R. *. FOSTER, xxx-xx-xx...
AMY M. *. FRISK, xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER GARCIA, xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN S. *. GIBSON, xxx-xx-x...
RODNEY A. *. GRANDON, xxx-xx-x...
JILL M. *. GRANT, xxx-xx-x...
SARAH S. *. GREEN, xxx-xx-x...
DAVID P. *. GUERRERO, xxx-xx-x...
ROBIN L. *. HALL, xxx-xx-x...
JULIE K. *. HASDORFF, xxx-xx-xx...
JAMES M. *. HEATON, xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN R. HENLEY, xxx-xx-xx...
DAVID T. *. HENRY, xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES B. *. HERNICZ, xxx-xx-x...
DAVID C. *. HOFFMAN, xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL L. *. HOSSBACH, xxx-xx-x...
ANDY K. *. HUGHES, xxx-xx-x...
JOHN K. *. HUTSON, xxx-xx-x...
JOHN V. *. IMHOF, xxx-xx-x...
WINSTON J. *. JACKSON, xxx-xx-x...
KEVAN F. *. JACOBSON, xxx-xx-x...
KAREN L. *. JUDKINS, xxx-xx-x...
JOHN *. KASTENBAUER, xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT L. *. KILGORE, xxx-xx-x...
LAUREN B. *. LEEKER, xxx-xx-x...
JON L. *. LIGHTNER, xxx-xx-x...
JACQUELINE *. LITTLE, xxx-xx-xx...
JAMES K. *. LOVEJOY, xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY W. *. LUCAS, xxx-xx-x...
EVERETT *. MAYNARD, JR, xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS K. MICKLE, xxx-xx-x...
LESLIE A. *. NEPPER, xxx-xx-xx...
RICHARD B. *. OKEEFFE, xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN M. *. PARKE, xxx-xx-xx...
TIMOTHY *. PENDOLINO, xxx-xx-x...
ALLISON A. *. POLCHECK, xxx-xx-x...
WENDY A. *. POLK, xxx-xx-x...
MARK C. *. PRUGH, xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD J. *. REVIS, xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY P. *. RILEY, xxx-xx-x...
MARK A. *. RIVEST, xxx-xx-x...
MARITZA S. RYAN, xxx-xx-x...
KATHRYN *. SOMMERKAMP, xxx-xx-x...
BRADLEY P. *. STAI, xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL I. *. STUMP, xxx-xx-x...
BEDARD M. *. TALBOT, xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE J. *. WILDE, xxx-xx-x...
JOHN I. *. WINN, xxx-xx-x...

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF MAJOR UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

EDUARDO ACOSTA, xx...
SCOTT R. ADAMS, xx...
WILLIAM T. AKANA, xx...
MARTIN S. ALMQUIST, xx...
KENNETH W. AMIDON, xx...
ROBERT V. AMIRANTE, xx...
DONALD J. ANDERSON, xx...
MICHAEL B. ANDERSON, xx...
TRUMAN D. ANDERSON, JR, xx...
STEVEN J. ANDREWS, xx...
PHILLIP J. ANTONINO, xx...
LYLE O. ARMEL, III, xx...
TERRY R. ARMSTRONG, xx...
JOEL K. ASHINHURST, xx...
PATRICK E. BAILEY, xx...
LAURENT O. BAKER, xx...
MICHAEL L. BAKER, xx...
STEPHEN C. BAKER, xx...
STEVEN J. BAKER, xx...
MARK D. BALLINGER, xx...
THOMAS M. BANE, xx...
TIMOTHY M. BARNES, xx...
MAUREEN A. BASHAM, xx...
GREGORY D. BATES, xx...
MITCHELL A. BAUMAN, xx...
FRANK C. BAYNARD, JR, x...
ROBERT K. BEAUCHAMP, xx...
JOHN S. BENNETT, xx...
PAUL D. BENNETT, xx...
DAVID H. BERGER, xx...
MICHAEL A. BERMUDEZ, xx...
KENNETH D. BEST, xx...
STUART C. BETTS, xx...
KENNETH L. BEUTEL, xx...
WILLIAM D. BEYDLER, xx...
DONALD F. BIEDERMANN, JR, xx...
WAYNE W. BIEMOLT, xx...
WILLIAM L. BLAIR, II, xx...
CHRISTOPHE E. BLANCHARD, xx...
MARK C. BLAYDES, xx...
JOSHUA J. BOCCHINO, xx...
PAULA M. BOGDEWIC, xx...
JEFFREY W. BOLANDER, xx...
ROBERT G. BONSIGNORE, xx...
CHRISTOPHE M. BOURNE, xx...
JOHN H. BOWER, JR, xx...
GREGORY A. BOYLE, xx...
DARLENE A. BRABANT, xx...
JAMES R. BRADEN, xx...
THOMAS C. BRADEN, xx...
MARK A. BRILAKIS, xx...
JAMES M. BROCKMANN, xx...
DAVID E. BROOKS, xx...
LORIN K. BROWN, xx...
MARLON F. BROWN, xx...
RONALD E. BROWNING, xx...
DONALD S. BRUCE, xx...
RONALD J. BUIKEMA, xx...
STEVEN W. BUSBY, xx...
NEIL K. CADWALLADER, xx...
JAMES E. CALLAWAY, xx...
STEPHEN J. CAMERON, xx...
ERIC H. CARLSON, x...
THOMAS P. CARMODY, xx...
JOHN M. CARRETTI, xx...
DANIEL D. CARY, xx...
PAUL C. CASTO, xx...
EDWARD R. CAWTHON, xx...
KERRY A. CERNY, xx...
ROBERT H. CHASE, JR, xx...
DANIEL J. CHOIKE, xx...
MARK G. CIANCIOLO, xx...
LISA M. CICCHINI, xx...
GREG R. CLARE, x...
MARK A. CLARK, xx...
ROBERT D. CLINTON, xx...
RAYMOND E. COIA, xx...
TODD COKER, x...
PETER B. COLLINS, xx...
RICHARD D. COLVARD, xx...
CHRISTOPHE C. CONLIN, xx...
MARSHALL I. CONSIDINE, xx...
CHARLES J. COOGAN, x...
CHRISTOPHE M. COOKE, xx...
ALAN D. COPELAND, xx...
ROBERT A. CREEDON, II, xx...
ANN L. CRITTENDEN, xx...
JOHN P. CROOK, x...
KENNETH E. CROSBY, JR, xx...
STEPHEN W. CROWELL, xx...
FRANCIS X. CUBILLO, xx...
JAMES C. CUMMISKEY, xx...
RICHARD D. CURRAN, xx...
MARK R. CYR, xx...
JOSEPH H. DAAS, xx...
MARTIN E. DAHL, xx...
PETER K. DAHL, xx...
DOUGLAS J. DAILY, xx...
JAMES R. DALEY, xx...
MICHAEL G. DANA, xx...
MICHAEL R. DARNELL, xx...
PAUL S. DAUGHTRIDGE, xx...
JOSEPH D. DAUPLAISE, xx...
CARL E. DAVIS, xx...
PETER B. DAVIS, xx...
STEPHEN W. DAVIS, xx...
JAMES A. DAY, xx...
RODNEY L. DEARTH, xx...
ENRICO G. DEGUZMAN, xx...
GERALD A. DEPASQUALE, xx...
WILLIAM J. DEVLIN, xx...
KEVIN M. DEVORE, xx...
JAMES A. DIXON, xx...
BRUCE D. DONOVAN, xx...
DEREK J. DONOVAN, x...
BRENT A. DOUGLAS, xx...
STEVEN W. DOWLING, xx...
GARY C. DOWNEY, xx...
JOHN D. DOWNEY, xx...
THOMAS B. DOWNEY, xx...
EDWARD J. DUFFY, xx...
JOHN D. DULLE, xx...
CHARLES R. DUNLAP, xx...
CHARLES S. DUNSTON, xx...
WILLIAM E. DYE, xx...
BASCOM D. EAKER, x...
CHRISTOPHE M. EKMAN, xx...
JOHN K. ELDER, xx...
CHRISTOPHE H. ELLIS, xx...
THOMAS D. ELLIS, xx...
OWEN W. ENGLANDER, xx...
LEO A. FALCAM, JR, xx...
LESLYE J. FALCAM, xx...
JOSEPH L. FALVEY, JR, xx...
JOHN M. FARLEY, xx...
RONNIE J. FARMER, xx...
ALLAN M. FAXON, JR, xx...
GREGORY S. FERRANDO, xx...
PETER J. FERRARO, xx...
TIMOTEO R. FIERRO, JR, xx...
DEAN E. FISH, xx...
JOHN A. FORQUER, xx...
DAVID G. FRITZ, xx...
DAVID C. FUQUEA, xx...
STEVEN H. FUTCH, xx...
DANIEL P. GANNON, xx...
JOHN C. GAUTHIER, xx...
BART R. GENTRY, x...
STEVEN J. GOTTLIEB, xx...
JAMES L. GOUGH, xx...
WILLIAM R. GRACE, xx...
GLEN C. GRAHAM, xx...
JACOB L. GRAHAM, xx...
DAVID S. GREENBURG, xx...
PATRICK J. GREENE, xx...
KENNETH C. GRENIER, xx...
PAUL D. GRENSEMAN, xx...
JUDY A. GRETCH, xx...
RAYBURN G. GRIFFITH, xx...
ERIC W. GUENTHER, xx...
CARL A. GUMPERT, JR, xx...
ELLEN K. HADDOCK, xx...
KEVIN J. HAGENBUCH, xx...
JAMES E. HALL, xx...
JEFFREY A. HALTERMAN, xx...
STEVEN P. HAMMOND, xx...
SCOTT P. HANEY, xx...
DONALD K. HANSEN, x...
JOHN D. HARRIGAN, xx...
DANIEL F. HARRINGTON, xx...
KATHLEEN V. HARRISON, xx...
GUY F. HARTMAN, xx...
RICHARD M. HASEY, xx...
KIP J. HASKELL, xx...
MICHAEL G. HAWKINS, xx...
DALE B. HAYWARD, xx...
DAVID J. HEAD, xx...
BRIAN J. HEARNSBERGER, xx...
MICHAEL R. HENDERSON, xx...
JOHN E. HICKEY, III, xx...
PAUL K. HILTON, xx...
MARK P. HINES, xx...
RANDALL A. HODGE, xx...
DEBRA L. HOFSTETTER, xx...
STEVEN D. HOGG, xx...
JOLENE L. HOLLINGSHEAD, xx...
STEVEN E. HOLMES, xx...
ERIC C. HOLT, xx...
DAVID K. HOUGH, xx...
KIRK W. HOWARD, xx...
JERRY D. HOWELL, xx...
CHARLES L. HUDSON, xx...
TIMOTHY H. HUETE, xx...
CHARLES G. HUGHES, III, xx...
DAVID W. HUNT, xx...
THOMAS R. HUNT, xx...
ROBIN R. HYDE, xx...
RONALD P. IRICK, xx...
CHARLES H. JAY, xx...
ERIC P. JOHNSON, xx...
ROBERT E. JOHNSON, xx...

RONN C. JOHNSON, xx...
MATTHEW D. JONES, xx...
RAY JONES, xx...
STANLEY J. JOZWIAK, xx...
DANIEL P. KAEPERNIK, xx...
PATRICK J. KANEWSKE, xx...
BILLY D. KASNEY, xx...
JAMES A. KAZIN, xx...
CHRISTIAN J. KAZMIERCZAK, x...
MICHAEL J. KEEGAN, xx...
ROBERT G. KELLY, xx...
PARRY P. KEOGH, xx...
BRUCE G. KESSELRING, xx...
CAROL A. KETTENRING, xx...
TIMOTHY J. KIBBEN, xx...
DOUGLAS M. KING, xx...
EDWIN T. KING, xx...
MARK A. KING, xx...
DAVID M. KLUEGEL, xx...
JAMES M. KNELL, xx...
EDWIN L. KOEHLER, JR., xx...
RICHARD W. KOENEKE, xx...
ROGER L. KRAFT, JR., xx...
DONNA J. KRUEGER, xx...
MARCIA A. KUEHL, x...
JOHN B. LANG, xx...
JAMES K. LAVINE, xx...
STEPHEN G. LEBLANC, xx...
WILLIAM P. LEEK, xx...
WILLIAM G. LEFTWICH, III, xx...
MICHAEL E. LEWIS, xx...
FREDERIC W. LICKTEIG, x...
DANIEL E. LIDDELL, xx...
BRADLEY C. LINDBERG, xx...
STEPHEN J. LINDER, xx...
CHARLES E. LOCKE, JR., xx...
GREGORY E. LOCKE, x...
JOHN P. LOPEZ, xx...
PETER J. LOUGHLIN, xx...
JUERGEN M. LUKAS, xx...
KENNETH C. LYLES, xx...
JACK A. MABERRY, xx...
BRUCE D. MACLACHLAN, xx...
MYRON J. MAHER, JR., xx...
DAVID A. MAHONEY, xx...
JAMES C. MALLON, xx...
GARY W. MANLEY, xx...
MICHAEL J. MANUCHE, xx...
MARK E. MAREK, x...
LESLIE C. MARSH, xx...
NICHOLAS J. MARSHALL, xx...
JONATHAN W. MARTIN, xx...
JAMES B. MARTINEZ, JR., xx...
ROBERT A. MARTINEZ, xx...
DAVID E. MARVIN, x...
TIMOTHY P. MASSEY, x...
PETER D. MATT, xx...
JAMES C. MATTIE, xx...
CAROL A. MCBRIDE, xx...
FRANKLIN F. MCCALLISTER, xx...
PETER T. MCCLENAHAN, x...
JEFFREY T. MCFARLAND, xx...
RONALD E. MCGEE, xx...
MARK D. MCMANNIS, xx...
PETER B. MCMURRAN, xx...
JEFFREY G. MEEKS, xx...
DANNY L. MELTON, xx...
LAWRENCE D. MEYER, xx...
MICHAEL G. MILLER, xx...
PAMELA D. MILLER, xx...
RALPH F. MILLER, xx...
RICHARD A. MINOR, xx...
JAMES G. MITCHELL, JR., xx...
WILLIAM R. MITCHELL, x...
STEVEN B. MOLINE, xx...
JOSEPH MOLOFSKY, xx...
ROBERT L. MOORE, JR., xx...
MICHAEL F. MORGAN, xx...
EDWARD J. MOSS, x...
DENIS P. MULLER, xx...
KEVIN P. MURPHY, xx...
MARK S. MURPHY, xx...
KEVIN J. NALLY, xx...
DONALD G. NEAL, xx...
DAVID A. NEESEN, xx...
RONALD G. NEILSON, xx...
WALTER L. NIBLOCK, xx...
DANNY P. ODOM, xx...
JAMES D. ODWYER, xx...
JAMES G. OHAGAN, xx...
JOHN C. OKEEFE, xx...
DAVID P. OLSEN, xx...
ISMAEL ORTIZ, JR., xx...
JOHN M. OWENS, xx...
KURT S. OWERMOHLE, xx...
STANLEY A. PACKARD, x...
STEVEN J. PARKER, xx...
WILL J. PEAVY, xx...
DINO PEROS, xx...
JOSEPH M. PERRY, xx...
DANIEL J. PETERS, xx...
STEVEN R. PETERS, xx...
CHARLES A. PETERSON, xx...
ILDEFONSO PILLOTOLIVE, II, xx...
MARK W. PLACEY, xx...
JAMES J. POLETO, JR., xx...
RICHARD S. POMARICO, xx...
CARL R. PORCH, xx...
MICHAEL D. PORTER, x...
RAY D. PRATHER, xx...
RUSSEL O. PRIMEAUX, xx...
JOSEPH D. PROVENZANO, III, xx...
FRANCIS R. QUIGLEY, xx...
THOMAS A. QUINTERO, xx...
LOUIS N. RACHAL, xx...
JACKY E. RAY, xx...
JOHN P. RAYDER, xx...
RICHARD M. RAYFIELD, x...
JON W. REBHOLZ, xx...
MATTHEW D. REDFERN, x...
TIMOTHY J. REEVES, xx...
RAYMOND G. REGNER, JR., xx...
MICHAEL F. REINEBERG, xx...
JAMES A. REISTRUP, xx...
HARRIET S. REYNOLDS, xx...
GREGORY J. RHODES, xx...
THOMAS H. RICH, x...
LARRY J. RICHARDS, xx...
DAVID M. RICHTSMEIER, xx...
JEFFREY S. RINGHOFFER, xx...
NEIL R. RINGLEE, xx...
DAVID R. ROBB, xx...
HERBERT M. ROBBINS, xx...
JAMES A. ROBERTS, xx...
JOSEPH M. ROCHA, x...
MICHAEL J. RODERICK, xx...
DANIEL S. ROGERS, xx...
THOMAS C. ROSKOWSKI, xx...
JAMES E. ROSS, xx...
JOSE D. ROVIRA, xx...
DAVID D. ROWLANDS, xx...
ROBERT R. RUARK, xx...
MICHAEL E. RUDOLPH, xx...
JOSEF E. RYBERG, xx...
ROBERT G. SALESSES, xx...
DONALD W. SAPP, x...
BRADFORD M. SARGENT, xx...
HIDEO SATO, xx...
RICHARD A. SCHAFER, xx...
CLARKE J. SCHIFFER, xx...
RICHARD W. SCHMIDT, JR., xx...
ALAN D. SCHROEDER, xx...
SUE I. SCHULER, xx...
ROSS H. SCHWALM, xx...
MARK E. SCHWAN, xx...
VERNON C. SCOGGIN, xx...
JOHN C. SEIBEL, xx...
JEFFREY M. SENG, xx...
JOHN M. SESSOMS, xx...
SCOTT E. SHAW, xx...
TERENCE E. SHEAHAN, xx...
ROBERT E. SHELOR, xx...
JEFFREY R. SHERMAN, xx...
JOHN L. SHISSLER, III, xx...
JOHN E. SHOOK, xx...
MICHAEL A. SHUPP, xx...
GREGORY P. SIESEL, xx...
DOUGLAS S. SIMMANG, x...
MARK A. SINGLETON, xx...
JAMES R. SINNOTT, xx...
GEORGE S. SLEY, JR., xx...
GARY E. SLYMAN, xx...
BRENT A. SMITH, xx...
JAMES C. SMITH, xx...
MICHAEL J. SMITH, xx...
TIMOTHY R. SNYDER, x...
ROBERT G. SOKOLOSKI, x...
ALFRED C. SOTO, xx...
VICTOR F. SPLAN, xx...
DUANE T. SPURRIER, xx...
DAVID F. STADTLANDER, xx...
THOMAS A. STAFSLIEN, xx...
JAMES L. STALNAKER, xx...
GLENN T. STARNES, xx...
TIMOTHY B. STARRY, xx...
TERRY D. STEELE, xx...
THOMAS N. STENT, xx...
VINCENT R. STEWART, xx...
DOUGLAS M. STILWELL, xx...
JOHN P. STIMSON, xx...
ARNOLD E. STOCKHAM, xx...
ANTHONY J. STOCKMAN, xx...
CHRISTOPHE L. STOKES, xx...
JAY A. STOUT, xx...
JOHN C. STRADLEY, JR., xx...
PETER J. STRENG, xx...
DARRYL STRINGFELLOW, xx...
MARK H. STROMAN, xx...
JOSEPH A. SUGGS, xx...
JOHN M. SULLIVAN, JR., xx...
JOSEPH L. SULLIVAN, xx...
STEVEN S. SUTZ, xx...
CALVIN F. SWAIN, JR., xx...
GREGORY H. SWAIN, x...
ELIZABETH A. SWEATT, xx...
ROLAND C. SWENSEN, xx...
TIMOTHY N. SZENDEL, xx...
NATHAN C. TABBERT, xx...
TERRENCE S. TAKENAKA, xx...
RORY E. TALKINGTON, xx...
MARK H. TANZLER, xx...
JAMES J. TAYLOR, xx...
LLOYD G. TETRAULT, xx...
ROBERT A. THIBERVILLE, xx...
JOHN D. THOMAS, JR., xx...
WILLIAM H. THOMAS, xx...
MICHAEL D. THYRRING, xx...
JEFFREY P. TOMCZAK, xx...
JAMES R. TRAHAN, xx...
BRADLEY R. TRIEBWASSER, xx...
RONALD E. TUCKER, xx...
ROBERT E. TURNER, JR., xx...
GREGORY S. TYSON, xx...
ERIC J. VANCAMP, xx...
MARK W. VANOUS, x...
EDWARD E. VAUGHT, xx...
PETER S. VERCRUYSSE, xx...
WILLIAM J. VIETS, xx...
SUSAN C. VISCONAGE, xx...
ANDREW L. VONADA, xx...
TIMOTHY J. WAGAR, xx...
DONALD A. WALTER, xx...
ERIC M. WALTERS, x...
PETER M. WALTON, x...
TROY A. WARD, xx...
LEAH B. WATSON, x...
JOHN M. WEBB, xx...
KEVIN W. WEBER, xx...
NATHAN O. WEBSTER, xx...
JOHN F. WEIGAND, x...
TIMOTHY C. WELLS, xx...
DAVID H. WESSNER, xx...
JOHN R. WEST, xx...
DAVID L. WHITE, xx...
MARK E. WHITED, xx...
SAMUEL T. WIDHALM, xx...
GARY D. WIEST, xx...
JOHN R. WILKERSON, x...
KEITH R. WILKES, xx...
FIELDING L. WILLIAMS, xx...
JOHN N. WILLIAMS, JR., xx...
MARTIN J. WRIGHT, xx...
GORDON D. YATES, xx...
KEN YOKOSE, xx...
PAUL R. YORIO, xx...
MONTE R. ZABEN, xx...
FRANCIS S. ZABOROWSKI, xx...
ROBERT S. ZAK, xx...
STEVEN R. ZESWITZ, xx...

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED COMMANDERS IN THE STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF CAPTAIN, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

MYRON DAVID ALMOND
MARY ALICE ANDERSON
STEPHANIE KAY BRODINE
MARK D. BROWNING
KATHRYN SLOMINS BUCHTA
JOSE FRANCISC CALDERON
ROBERT S. CARNES
MARK F. CLAPPER
PETER MICHAEL CLEMONS
WILLIAM THOMAS COLLINS
DAVID W. CORBETT
NICHOLAS ANT DAVENPORT
JAMES KENNETH DOLNEY
RONALD L. FOREHAND
JAMES R. FRASER
MICHAEL ROY FREDERICKS
KIM FRICKE GIBSON
BECKY LORETTE GILL
MARSHALL P. HANSEN
RICHARD G. HIBBS, JR
ELAINE CAMPBELL HOLMES
ROBERT R. JOHNSON
DAN MICHAEL JONES
BYUNG JIN MIN KIM
HAROLD BRANSFORD LAMB
GARY R. LAMMERT
URIEL ROMEY LIMJOCO
MICHAEL JAMES LOGUE
RODERICK F. LUHN
DAVID CURTIS MCLELLAN
MARK EDWIN MURPHY
JOHN HENRY NADING
JAMES JOSEPH J. NORCONK
RAYMOND PAUL OLAFSON
FRED PETER PALEOLOGO
PETER BENHAM PLATZER
JOSEPH N. RAGAN
MANUEL EN RIVERAALSINA
DAVID WAYNE ROBERTSON
JERRY WADE ROSE
DENNIS ALAN ROWLEY
JOHN MICHAEL RUSSELL
LEO B. SIMMONS, JR
JAMES R. SOWELL
JAMES WARREN STEGER
RICHARD STOCK
STEVEN R. WARLICK
ROBERT J. WELSCH
NATALIE A. WILLENBERG
WILLIAM M. YARBROUGH
THADDEUS RIC ZAJDOWICZ

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

JAMES SAMUEL ANDERSON
MAX FRANCIS BAUMGARTNER
WILLIAM RONALD BELL
THOMAS ALLEN BUNKER
ROBERT NORMAN BURTON, JR
KEVIN ROSS CARMAN
JAMES EDWARD COOK
WYNN LEWIS COON
HAROLD THOMAS CRONAUER, JR
MARY ELLEN DAVIDSON
JAMES CLIFTON DAVIS, III
MARK EDWARD EASTON
MICHAEL LEROY ERNO
MICHAEL EDWARD FINLEY
CHRISTOPHER GEORGE HAUSER
GERALD FRANK HESCH
JOHN JOSEPH HUND
WILLIAM ANDREW JACKSON
WILLIAM JAMES MCMICAN
ROBERT LEE MILLIGAN
RICHARD E. PAUL MORRISON, JR
TIMOTHY OLIN MUNSON
STEWART ALBERT NELSON
WILLIAM DAVID ORR
EDWARD WESLEY PINION
JAMES SUMNER ROUNTREE
DAVID ALBERT SONA
JOHN HAROLD STEPHENS
RONALD FRANCIS VEROSTEK
CHARLES MAYS VINSON
CLIFFORD HOLLOWAY WAITS, JR
DAVID WINFIELD WALTON
KENNETH EDMUND WENZEL
WILLIAM ARTHUR WRIGHT
MARK ALAN YOUNG

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

JEFFERSON D. ATWATER
DONALD G. BELANUS
THOMAS C. CARTER
MELVIN RAY FERGUSON
LOY BLANE HAMILTON
MARSHALL ROY LARRIVIERE
GARY VEIL LYONS
PETER ANDREW ODDO
EUGENE E. OLESON
ROGER W. PACE

GEORGE W. PUCCIARELLI
ARNOLD E. RESNICOFF
STEPHEN BRENNAN ROCK
MOSES L. STITH
GERALD S. VINTINNER

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

LEE LAWRENCE ANDERSON, JR
JAMES HENRY AUGUSTIN, JR
THOMAS MATTISON BOOTHE
PAUL LEROY CLOUGH
JAMES THOMAS CORBETT
STEPHEN WILLIAM DAIGNAULT
JOHN RAYMOND DOYLE
DAVID WILLIAM GORDEN
RICHARD FREDRICK HAAS, JR
DONALD BRUCE HUTCHINS
JAMES BRUCE KENDALL
COURTNEY CRAIG KLEVEN
JOSEPH CARL KNOLL
MICHAEL WALLACE PRASKIEVICZ
DAVID GERARD ROACH
RICHARD LEONARD STEINBRUGGE
BURTON LOYAL STREICHER
PETER MARTIN VANDYK
ROBERT ENRIQUE YBANEZ

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

WESTON D. BURNETT
WILLIAM A. DECICCO
GLENN NELSON GONZALEZ
CHARLES RONALD HUNT
GERALD JOS KIRKPATRICK
TIMOTHY L. LEACHMAN
SALLY JEAN MCCABE
RONALD VICTOR SWANSON
THOMAS PETER TIELENS

DENTAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

CHARLES ALA BOOKWALTER
JOHN D. BRAMWELL
WILLIAM M. DERN
WILLIAM B. DURM, IV
MARION COLUMB ELDRIDGE
ALFRED W. FEHLING, JR
TIMOTHY J. FLANIGAN
ROBERT K. FLATH
JOSEPH A. GLORIA
ROBERT E. HUTTO
LAWRENCE D. KISELICA
GREGORY G. KOZLOWSKI
FRANK JAMES KRATOCHVIL
THOMAS O. MORK
ALBERT CHAR RICHARDSON
PAUL EDWARD SCHMID
CHARLES WILLIAM TURNER
ROBERT JEFFREY TURNER
RICHARD C. VINCI
JOHN A. WEISENSEEL
JOSEPH C. WHITT
DALE E. WILCOX
PAUL MARSHALL WILEY

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

JERRY THOMAS ANDERSON
JERRY WAYNE BRICKEEN
WILLIAM GLENN BROWN
DENNIS RALPH BROZOWSKI
TOMMY WAYNE COX
THOMAS RICHA DEFIBAUGH
ROBERT LAWRENCE EDMONS
MELVYN ADAMS ESTEY, JR
PETER PAUL GARMS
DAVID ROYAL GERVAIS
ERNEST RICHARD GHENT
DEAN F. GLICK
DAVID ALLEN HARGETT
LAYTON OSCAR HARMON
RODNEY DALE HICKEY
RUDOLPH JONES
RALPH ALVIS LOCKHART
JUDITH ANNE MCCARTHY
AARON MCCLERKLIN
GERARD VINCENT MESKILL
THOMAS DALTON NUNN, JR
STEVEN DUANE OLSON
VERNON MELVIN PETERS
CHARLES JOSEPH ROSCIAM
CARL WILLIAM STEIN
FREDERICK RIC TITTMANN

NURSE CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

ELIZABETH R. BARKER
MARY ALICE BOWDEN
JOHN FREDERICK BOYER
JUDITH CO BRINCKERHOFF
MARY ANN CRONIN
GARY R. HARMEYER
ELIZABETH K. KOZERO
ROSALIE DAY LEWIS
SHIRLEY DEA LEWISBROWN
DAVID STEWART LOOSE
GEORGE LAWRENCE MARSH
LINDA UNGVARSK MCMAHON
PATRICIA JEANNE OHARE
DONNA JEAN VAN OHLMAN
CHRISTINE ANNE PICCHI
LESLIE ELIZAB ROBINSON
EVELYN RUTH SHAIA
JACQUELINE ELAI SHARPE
CATHERINE ANN SWAN
JANE WESTMOREL SWANSON
RONALD LAWRENC VANNEST

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR TO AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be commander

RONALD LEE AASLAND
THOMAS ABERNETHY
MARK THOMAS ACKERMAN
ALLAN ARTHUR ADELL
DONALD W. AIKEN
STEVEN PATRICK ALBERT
JOHN D. ALEXANDER
BERT R. ALGOOD
MARTIN ROBERT ALLARD
DAVID LEE ALLEN
SHERRIE SUSAN ALY
JOHN MICHAEL AMICARELLA
KEVIN S. AMOS
JOHN P. ANDERSON
MARK ALLEN ANDERSON
THOMAS ROBERT ANDRESS
NEAL EDWIN ANDUZE
MICHAEL DENNIS ANHALT
SCOTT TIMOTHY ANHALT
DANNY WAYNE ARMSTRONG
DAVID SPENCER ARMSTRONG
JACQUELYN MARIE YO ARROWOOD
ROBERT BRYANT ASMUS
GREGORY FRANCIS ATCHISON
DOUGLAS ELLIOTT ATKINS
STACY SETSUMI AZAMA
DAVID A. BABCOCK
ROBERT B. BADGETT
STEVEN MALLARD BAGBY
RODNEY LEE BAKER
MARK W. BALMERT
BENJAMIN HIRAM BANKSTON
STEVEN B. BARNES
THOMAS DAVENPORT BARNS
WELROSE ERNEST BARTLEY, II
LARRY STEVE BARTON
MICHAEL STEPHEN BASFORD
DALE R. BATEY
KENNETH JOSEPH BITAR
ROBLEY JAMES BLANDFORD
WILLIAM MICHAEL BLASCZYK
MARK STEPHEN BOENSEL
ROBERT A. BOGDANOWICZ
JOEL E. BOHLMANN
BRUCE STANLEY BOLE
HARRY P. BOLICH
ROBERTA BESS BOLYARD
NORMAN B. BOSTER
KENNETH DWANE BOWERSOX
JOHN L. BOWLES
JOHN HARRISON BOWLING, III
AUSTIN WALKER BOYD, JR
MICHAEL EDWARD BOYD
JANE DENISE BOYER
CEDRIC ANTONIO BRADFIELD
THOMAS HENRY BRADY, JR
TED N. BRANCH
BOB ALLAN BRAUER
CARL WILLIAM BRAUN
STEVEN LEET BRIGANTI
JAMES E. BROCKINGTON
DENNIS NMN BROSKA
DAVID P. BROWN
ROBERT MARTIN BROWN
THEODORE HAROLD BROWN
DAVID W. BRUCE
DALE ALLEN BRUETTING
ROBERT A. BUEHN, JR
FREDERICK M. BUESSER
RICHARD WARREN BUMP
DAVID AUSTIN BURDINE
WILLIAM R. BURKE
DAVID ALAN BURKHARD
WILLIAM JOHN BURROWS
DAVID H. BUSS
WARREN RUSSELL BYRUM
JAMES KENDALL CAMPBELL
JEFFREY REID CAMPBELL
WILLIAM HENRY CAMPBELL
JOHN MICHAEL CARAM
KENDALL L. CARD
JO ANNE CARLTON
PATRICK BRENDAN CARMODY
LARRY IRVIN CARPENTER
JAMES M. CARR
NELSON MARZAN CAYABYAB
VICTOR LEE CERNE
BARBARA JEAN NEL CHADBOURNE
RICHARD CHAPMAN
JAMES R. CHEEVER
KEVIN R. CHEEZUM
PATRICIA ANN CHMIEL
JACK CHRISTENSEN
PETER HUGH CHRISTENSEN
DAVID WILLIAM CHRISTIE
LEWIS JOSEPH CIOCHETTO
JAMES P. CLAGER
BRIAN GORDON CLARK
JANEEN WEST IGOU CLEMENS
JANEL DEE COBERY
DARRELL L. COFSKY
JOHN E. J. COHOON
ROBERT EDWARD CONNERY, JR
JOHN G. COOKE
RUTH ANNE COOPER
MAUREEN T. COPELOF
MIMI NMN CORCORAN
ANTHONY THOMAS CORTESE
RALPH R. COSTANZO
JOHN M. COSTELLO
JERRY WAYNE COUFAL
CRAIG H. COWEN
WILLIAM R. COY, JR
CLINTON HARRISON CRAGG
DONALD CARR CRAWFORD
STEPHEN MICHAEL CRAWFORD
MICHAEL D. CRISP
WILLIAM THOMAS CROOKS, JR
MICHAEL KERBIE CROSBIE
THOMAS D. CROWLEY
ROBERT KEITH CRUMPLAR
GREGORY STEVEN CRUZE
SHELLEY JO CRUZE
ROBERT L. CULLINAN
ROBERT MICHAEL CURTIS
STEPHEN P. CURTIS
STEVEN WILLIAM DAILEY
MICHAEL V. DANIEL
MARSHALL DEAN DAUGHERTY
CINDY MARIE DAVIDSON
JEFFREY J. DAVIS
SHARON ANN DEEMS
NANCY LAMBERT DEITCH
EDWARD J. DEMARTINI, JR
WILLARD EUGENE DENTON
KATHRYN LOUISE DESTAFNEY
KENNETH WILLIAM DEUTSCH
HOWARD SHELEY BAYES
GERALD ROGER BEAMAN
DEBORAH ANN BECKER
RICHARD CARLTON BEDFORD
BRIAN EUGENE BENNETT
RICHARD SCOTT BENNETT
THOMAS A. BENNETT
SCOTT ALAN BERG
STEVEN M. BERGER
DAVID DWIGHT BIGELOW
THOMAS J. BILY
CARL DAVID BINDMAN
JEFFREY DAVID DEVONCHIK
JEFFREY KENT DICKMAN
ANDREW LAWRENCE DIEFENBACH
CRAIG M. DIFFIE
KATHRYN ANNE DIMAGGIO
MARY CHARLOTTE DIMEL
DONALD R. DITKO
JAMES M. DOHERTY
KEVIN C. DONLON
CARL W. DOSSEL
MARTIN A. DRAKE
ROBERT WAYNE DRASH
CLIFFORD DALE DRISKILL
DENNIS D. DUBARD
RICKEY LYNN DUBBERLY
LEE JOSEPH DUCHARME
JOHN T. DUGENE
MICHAEL FRANCIS DULKE
WILLIAM M. DUNKIN
NAN BERYLL DUPUY
MICHAEL A. DURNAN
GARY BRYAN DYE
WILLIAM JEFFREY EARL
DONALD LEWIS EBERLY
VICTOR ANTHONY EDELMANN, JR
CATHERINE ELIZABETH EDWARDS
RICHARD THOMA EGAN
GERARD T. EGLER
JOHN F. EHLERS
DAINE E. EISOLD
MATTHEW P. ELIAS
ALFRED BART ELKINS
ROBERT HAROLD ELLIS
MARTIN J. ERDOSSY, III
DAVID E. ERICKSON
WILLIAM P. ERVIN
GARY JOHN EVANS
DAVID ERIC EYLER
DONALD JESSE FAIRFAX
FARIS T. FARWELL
DAVID EDWARD FAY, JR
MICHAEL LLOYD FELMLY
RICHARD PAUL FERGUSON
MARK BRITTON FINCH
SUSAN JANE FINLAY
MICHAEL JEFFERY FISCHER
J. G. FITZGERALD
GLENN FLANAGAN
MARC A. FLEMING
PETER S. FLYNN
GLENN AARON FOGG
PAMELA MERRY BROWN FORBES
JAMES MICHAEL FORDICE
JEFFREY L. FOWLER
MARK IRBY FOX
MICHAEL C. FRALEN
JOHN EDWARD FRASER
LINDA JEAN FRASERANDREWS
DAVID JEROME FREDERICK
BOYD M. FREEBOROUGH
GEORGE JEFFREY FULLERTON
STEPHEN M. GAHAN
MICHAEL JAMES GALPIN
LAWRENCE FRANCIS GALVIN
BRET CARLETON GARY
JUNE ALYCE GASTON
JOSEPH ANDRE GATTUSO, JR
DONNA VANCE NELSON GEIGER
GERALD WILLIAM GELETZKE
STEPHEN A. GIESEN
JEFFREY R. GINNOW
ROBERT R. GIRARD
ALFRED GONZALEZ
THOMAS DAVID GOODALL
ROBERT O. GOODMAN
VALENTINA CARGOS GOODMAN
JOHN G. GOOGE
JAMES WILLIAM GOULD
PHILIP W. GRANDFIELD
DEBORAH LEA GRANT
ARTHUR NICHOLAS GRATAS
DOUGLAS D. GRAU
GEORGE LEWIS GRAVESON, III
JOHNNY L. GREEN
MICHAEL J. GREENE
PHILIP HILLIARD GREENE, JR
JACK ALAN GREENSPAN
JOAN MCDONALD GUILFORD
ROBERT ALLAN GURCZYNSKI
ROBERT H. GUY, JR
WALTER C. HABERLAND
NORMA LEE HACKNEY
JOSEPH BRUCE HAMILTON
JOHN ALVA HANCOCK
CECIL E. HANEY
CLARE W. HANSON, II
PAUL CHRISTIAN HANSON
HUGH MCLEOD HARDAWAY
ROBERT PAUL HARGER
DEON AUSTIN HARKEY
WILLIAM DONALD HARRINGTON
CRAIG F. HARRIS
DOUGLAS W. HARRIS
HARRY B. HARRIS
JAMES PATRICK HARRIS
CHARLES B. HASBROUCK, III
MARK H. HASKIN
JOHN R. HASTINGS
CHARLES A. HAUTAU
JOHN ROOSEVELT HAWK, III
THOMAS CAREY HAYES
PETER JOSEPH HEALEY

HARRY ALFRED HEATLEY
DIRK P. HEBERT
CHARLES DONALD HEISER
WILLIAM JOE HENDRICKSON
PETER HENRIK HENDRIKSON
JOHN R. HENNIGAN
KARL ANDREW HETTLER
CHARLES DUANE HEUGHAN
GARY BENNETT HICKS
LYNNE MARGO HICKS
RICHARD ARTHUR HICKS, II
DONALD DAVID HILL
GREGORY D. HILLIS
SUZANNE WOODMAN HIRSCH
FRANCIS A. HISER, III
CARY J. HITHON
ALEXANDER BRUCE HNARAKIS
PAUL J. HOBAN
FRANCIS XAVIER HOFF
RANDALL H. HOFFMAN
GREGORY PAUL HOGUE
MICHAEL J. HOLDEN
DANIEL HOLLOWAY
JOHN BARRY HOLLYER
THOMAS D. HOLMAN
PAUL STEVEN HOLMES
RICHARD ANTHONY HOLZKNECHT
PATRICK C. HOPFINGER
PAUL BRUCE HOUY
JOY LEE HOWARDSNOW
WILLIAM CHARLES HUGHES, JR
MICHAEL PAUL HUTTER
VERNON HUTTON, III
DARAH MARGARET HYLAND
DAVID LLOYD IRVINE
GLEN R. IVES
GREGG S. JACKSON
SUSAN ELIZABETH ST JANNUZZI
JAMES D. JEFFREY
DAVID G. JENKINS
MARK ERIC JENSEN
LARRY DEAN JOHNSON
RICHARD ERIC JOHNSON
SIGNE THERESE JOHNSON
STEVEN PAUL JOHNSON
MICHAEL JOHNSTON
THOMAS ALLEN JOHNSTON
JAMES A. JONES, JR
JOE DEAN JONES
LEONARD BERNARD JONES
PAULA LYNN JORDANEK
JOHN CHARLES KAMP
EDWARD F. KAMRADT
ROGER E. KAPLAN
ANDREW T. KARAKOS
WILLIAM JAMES KEAR
TIMOTHY PATRICK KEATING
RONALD G. KEIM
ROBIN N. KEISTER
LESLEY ANN KELLY
STUART OAKES KENDRICK
CHARLES BYNG KEY, III
STEVEN ANTHONY KIEPE
JOHN PRESTON KINDRED
DARYL AMSTER KING
LANNY LEIGH KING
STEVEN D. KINNEY
RICHARD JOHN KISER
EDWARD J. KLAPKA, JR
MIRIAM ANDERSON KLAPKA
MARGARET ANN KLEE
RAYMOND MICHAEL KLEIN
CHRISTOPHER A. KLYNE
MICHAEL GALEESE KNOLLMANN
ANDREW JAMES KOCH
LEIF H. KONRAD
JAMES ROBERT KOSLOW
MARK E. KOSNIK
GEORGE MICHAEL KOUCHERAVY
HAROLD CHRIS KREITLEIN
WARREN S. KRULL
JEFF CLARK KUHNREICH
DONALD ALAN KUNTZ
RICHARD K. KURRUS
JON DAVID LACKIE
MERLIN WILLIAM LADNER
CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH LAGEMANN
DANIEL M. LAMBERT
JOHN DAVID LAMBERT
PHILLIP ROBERT LAMONICA
LEWIS SCOTT LAMOREAUX, III
LINDA MARIE DAY LANCASTER
WILLIAM E. LANDAY
SCOTT A. LANGDON
STEPHEN B. LATTA
ROBERT JEFFREY LAUDERDALE
CHARLES THOMAS LAWSON
GARY R. LEAMAN
DAVID ALLAN LEARY
JASON A. LEAVER
HORACE M. LEAVITT
RAND D. LEBOUVIER
STEVEN EUGENE LEHR
CHARLES J. LEIDIG
LINDA MARIE LEWANDOWSKI
CHARLES DWIGHT LEWIS
JEFFREY GEORGE LEWIS
PETER JEWETT LEWIS
STEVE KIRK LILLEY
CARL ERIC LINDSTRAND
JOHN RICHIE LINK
STEPHEN C. LINNELL
KEVIN LINDSAY LITTLE
JAMES GERARD LOEFFLER
JAMES MICHAEL LOERCH
TRACY KEITH LOFTIS
ARNOLD OTTO LOTRING, JR
ALTON A. S. LOVVORN
DOUGLAS S. LOWE
JOHN F. LUKSIK, JR
JOSEPH MICHAEL LYNCH
PAUL K. LYNCH
DOUGLAS GRAEME MACCREA
JOHN EDWIN MACCROSSEN
RAYMOND TEX MACHASICK
LIZBETH LYNN MACKEY
DENHAM BRUCE MACMILLAN
ARCHER M. MACY, JR
CRAIG C. MADSEN
ALAN GARY MAIORANO
PAUL J. MALLON
MARK C. MANTHEY
STUART BRIAN MARKEY
JOSEPH MICHAEL MARLOWE
LAURA ANNE CARPENTE MARLOWE
BARBARA YVONNE MARSHJONES
DAVID WAYNE MARTIN
JOHN ALLEN MARTIN
JOSEPH R. MARTIN
WILLIAM ALEXANDER MARTIN
RICARDO MARTINEZ
CHARLES WALT MARTOGLIO
ROBIN FERGUSON MASON
MICHAEL GARY MATACZ
JAMES R. MATHERS
JEROME JAY MATHEWS
JAY KEVIN MATTONEN
MICHAEL R. MAXFIELD
DIXIE JOHN MAYS
DOUGLAS JOHN MCANENY
HUGH ROBERT MCATEER, JR
DONALD I. MCCALL
LINDA ANN MCCARTON
BRIAN JOSEPH MCCORMACK
MICHAEL MCCRABB
LARRY SAMUEL MCCRACKEN
MARY ANN MCCULLEN
ADRIAN CARRELL MCELWEE
THOMAS F. MCGUIRE
GORDON TORRES MCKENZIE
THOMAS MCKEON
TERENCE EDWARD MCKNIGHT
CLARENCE W. MCKOWN, JR
JOHN CABOT MCLAWHORN
DUNCAN GORDON MCLEAN
MARY MCLENDONKOENIG
PATRICK MICHAEL MCMILLIN
RONALD JAMES MCNEAL
MARTHA EGGERT MCWATTERS
MARK ALAN MEHLING
DAVID J. MERCER
BRIAN JOSEPH MEYERRIECKS
KURTIS JOHN MILLER
PATRICIA ANN MILLER
SCOT A. MILLER
STEVEN CRAIG MILLER
LEROY M. MILLS
STEVEN R. MINNIS
ARTHUR SCOTT MOBLEY
PAUL MARSHALL MOMANY
RICHARD JOHN MOONEY
MELANIE ELISE MOORE
MICHAEL M. MOORE
MELINDA LEE MORAN
JOHN PATRICK MORIN
ALAN GENE MORRIS
DAVID B. MORRISON
KEVIN NMN MORRISSEY
DAVID EMBREE MOSCA
ALAN C. MOSER
TERESA URBAN MOSIER
MICHAEL GEORGE MULCAHY
ROLAND JOHN MULLIGAN
CHRISTOPHER CYRUS MURRAY
MICHAEL JOHNSON MURRAY
ALLEN GARVER MYERS
RICHARD JAMES NAGLE, III
WILLIAM PATRICK NASH, JR
MARK S. NAULT
MARK S. NEEDLER
DALE MARTIN NEES
RICHARD ALVIN NEIDRAUER
ERIC KARL NELSON
PHILIP B. NELSON
JOHN FINLEY NEWCOMB
CHRISTOP NICHOLS
TERRY EVELL NOLAN
JOHN CHALMERS NOULIS, JR
ROBERT E. NOVAK
ALFRED STEVEN NUGENT, III
JOHN CORBET NUNLEY
CHRISTOPHER GLENN NUTTER
JAMES WILLIAM OCONNELL
JAMES DAVIS OLIVER, III
LARRY B. OLSEN
CHARLES S. ORMSON
DENNIS NMN OURLIAN
LESLIE ANN PAGE
ANN REBECCA PAINTER
GLENN P. PALMER
ANTONY FRANK PAPAPIETRO, JR
BETH HARRELL PAPWORTH
MATTHEW SCOTT PASZTALANIEC
RICHARD A. PAYNE
RICHARD HAROLD PAYNE
CARL MARTIN PEDERSON, JR
LAURA RETTA PEOPLES
PATRICK KEVIN PEPPE
ELEANOR KIRKPATRICK PERNELL
JOHN STEWART PETERSON
JOSEPH CARL PETERSON, JR
LAWRENCE EDWARD PHILLIPS
DAVID LAVON PHILMAN
CRAIG JOHN PICKART
CHARLES JAMES PIERCE, JR
FRANCIS S. PIERCE
TERRY CLIFFTON PIERCE
PAUL M. PIETSCH
JAMES E. PILLSBURY
RONALD CHRISTIAN PLUCKER
BARRY J. POCHRON
GARY LAWRENCE PODENAK
LEE NMN PONTES
DENNIS M. POPIELA
ARTHUR R. PORCELLI, JR
JOANN NMN PORTER
DANA RICHARD POTTS
CHRISTOPHER LEE POWERS
CLARK GORDON PRESSWOOD
LESTER L. PRICE
WALTER S. PULLAR, III
MARTHA LEETE PURDY
A. J. QUATROCHE
KEITH J. QUIGLEY
GALE RAE RADEBAUGH
JAMES WILLIAM RAINWATER
JOYCE ZELLWEGER RANDLE
MATTHEW G. RAUSCH
RONALD C. RAYMER
ORIN PAUL REAMS
NORI ANN REED
HOWARD F. REESE
JAMES T. REILLY
PAUL KARL REIMANN
THOMAS NMN REITMEYER
BRUCE DONALD REMICK
DENNIS DANA RENFRO
JAMES M. RENNIE
DAVID ALLEN RHODES
BENJAMIN ELLIOT RICHTER
WANDA LYNN RIDDLE
STEWART WARREN RIVALL
JAN GILBERT RIVENBURG
LYNN JANET ROBERTSON
BRIAN MARK ROBY
RENEE LEFEBVRE RODECK
MYLES ELLIOTT ROELING
GERARD DAVID RONCOLATO
JAMES F. ROOT
JOHN S. ROSA
PAUL K. ROSBOLT
ERIC R. ROSENLOF
STEVEN C. ROWLAND
T. G. RUBENSTEIN
PHILIP IRVING RUSSELL
PAUL J. RUSSO
KEVIN PAUL RYAN
ROBERT W. RYAN
MICHAEL SADDLER
FERDINAND LEWIS SALOMON, III
MITCHELL K. SAULS
HELEN JEANNETTE SCHAAL
MATTHEW EDWARD SCHELLHORN
WILLIAM ANDERSON SCHLICHTER
PAUL WALTER SCHMIDLE
JOHN MICHAEL SCHUMACHER
PETER PAUL SCHWAB
JAMES D. SCOLA
GRACE VALERIE SCRUGGS
JAMES MICHAEL SEAGLE
JAMES REID SEAMAN, JR
CATHY ROSE SEIFERT
KARL JOHN SEMMLER
ROBERT REID SENTER, JR
DANIEL D. SERFASS
ANN MARGARET SHEEDY
SHARON JO SHELTON
JUSTIN M. SHERIN, JR
JOHN WILLIAM SHERMAN, JR
PATRICK JOSEPH SHERMAN
MICHAEL ROBERT SHUMAKER
CARY ALAN SILVERS
DARRELL THOMAS SINK
PETER J. SISA
CLIFFORD ARTHUR SKELTON
WILLIAM F. SLAGLE
CATHERINE JOSEPHINE SLEETH
MARTHA JANE SMART
RICHARD EUGENE SMETHERS, JR
CHARLES EDWARD SMITH
DANNY JOE SMITH
DAVID MARSHALL SMITH
DOUGLAS M. SMITH
MICHALA MARY SMITH
RICHARD WHITNEY SMITH
RICHARD B. SOUTHARD, JR
ROBERT S. SOWELL
MARK EDWARD SPECK
SCOTT ALAN SPENCER
TIMOTHY PATRICK SPRAGUE
DANIEL LEE SQUIRES
JOHN D. STALNAKER
HENRY TURNER STANLEY, III
MARK ALAN STEARNS
WILLIAM BRUCE STEDMAN
FLOYD LEROY STEED

ANN CATHERINE STEWART
RICHARD GLENN STEWART
RONALD PAUL STITES
JOHN K. STUART, JR
ROBERT M. STUART
SCOTT MICHAEL STUETZER
WILLIAM SEBASTIAN STUHR
JOHN BELLOWS STURGES, III
ALAN ROGER SULLIVAN
JOHN ANTHONY SULLIVAN
JOSEPH EDWARD SULLIVAN
MARY MAUREEN SULLIVAN
KRISTI HOLLI CHASE SUNDIN
PATRICIA J. SUNKLE
PAUL K. SUSALLA
PHILLIP TIM SWANSON
JERRY C. SWARTZ
MARY JOSEPHINE SWEENEY
WADE CARL TALLMAN
SAM J. TANGREDI
DANIEL A. TANSEY
ROBERT R. TAYLOR
GEORGE R. TEUFEL
BRIAN CHRISTIAN THOMAS
MICHAEL J. THOMAS
RONALD LOUIS THOMAS
TIMOTHY MARK THOMAS
GEORGE WESLEY THOMPSON, JR
ROLLAND CHARLES THOMPSON
DAVID NATHAN THORSON
KURT WALTER TIDD
WILLIAM G. TIMME
CHARLES NMN TIMON, JR
GREGORY PAUL TIMONEY
PATRICK THOMAS TOOHEY
GEOFFREY CHARLES TORRANCE
TODD DOUGLAS TRACY
TERRELL LEE TRIBBLE
RODERICK EDWIN TRICE
TOM CRAIG TRUDELL
PAMELA WEBB TUBBS
MARK RICHARD ULANDER
ROBERT BURTON UPCHURCH
DONALD E. VANCE
PIETER N. A. VANDENBERGH
JAN MAARTEN VANTOL
PETER THEODORE VAS, III
DEAN KARL VAUGHN
DAVID A. VEATCH
MARK RUSSELL VOLLMER
GEORGE M. WADZITA
DANIEL M. WALBORN
GARY L. WALDRON
JOEL NATHANIEL WALKER
STEVEN C. WALKER
JOHN P. WALLACE
LESTER A. WALLACE
STEPHEN JOSEPH WALSH
THOMAS LORENZO WALSTON, III
JOHN EDWARD WALTERS
LAWRENCE M. WALWORTH
JAMES FREDERICK WARD, III
WILLARD RICHARD WARFIELD
WILLIAM BRIAN WATKINS
JAMES L. WEAVER
PHILIP DURANT WEBER
DAVID CALVIN WEEKS
JOHN ANDREW WEIDNER
STEPHEN NELSON WEILBACHER
ROBERT K. WEIMER
CHARLES HERMAN WEISS, JR
MARK S. WELCH
RODGER L. WELCH
WILLIAM GREGORY WELLS
DANIEL LATHROP WENCESLAO
DOUGLAS FRANK WHALEN
BLAKE ELLIS WHITE
GARRY RONALD WHITE
GLEN THOMAS WHITE
KEVIN EUGENE WHITE
TIMOTHY ALAN WHITE
JOHN BERYL WHITSELL
MARK RICHARD WHITTINGTON
MICHAEL SEAN WHITTY
DONALD RUSSELL WICKS
LINDA ELLEN WIDMAIER
MANFRED WILLIAM WIDMAN, JR
LARRY DWIGHT WILCHER
WILLIAM GEORGE WILCOX, JR
JACOB P. WILKINS
JONATHAN EVERETT WILL
ALDEN GREGORY WILLIAMS
CARL EDWARD WILLIAMS
DAVID A. WILLIAMS
DAVID ROBINSON WILLIS
CHARLES EDWARD WILSON, JR
MARY THERESA WINGER
ROBERT ORVILLE WIRT, JR
CHARLES S. WITTEN
CHRISTOPHER MARK WODE
WINSTON D. WOOD
MARY ANNE WOODBURY
GLEN O. WOODS
MICHAEL ALLEN WORTHINGTON
KEITH LEON WRAY
RICHARD BURTON WREN
JOSEPH M. YANICHECK, JR
ROY LEE YAPLE
RICHARD J. YASKY
ARTHUR WAYNE YENDREY
EARLE SWISHER YERGER
ROLF A. YNGVE
ALBERT W. YODER
DAVID G. YOSHIHARA
ORRIN W. YOUNG
JOHN MARSHALL YURCHAK
ROBERT ZALASKUS
DEBORAH ANNE ZANOT
JOSEPH E. ZAVODNY
STANLEY N. ZEHNER
PAUL MICHAEL ZIEGLER
RUSSELL MARK ZIEGLER
GEORGE WILLIAMS ZIMMERMAN
EDWARD C. ZUREY, JR
MARY JO ZUREY

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS

To be commander

CARL LEE ANDERSON
STEVEN L. BROOKS
RONALD ANTHONY CROWELL
PADRAIC K. FOX
WILLIAM ROBERT FRITCHIE
MARK A. GILBERTSON
CHARLES HAROLD GODDARD
DON W. GOLD
THOMAS L. GRODEK
ALAN EDWARD HAGGERTY
DONALD ROY HALL
PAUL DAVID HILL
FREDERICK F. HILLENBRAND, III
CHARLES LOUIS HOPKINS, III
GLENN ROY HOTTEL
STEPHEN LEO JOSEPH
DANIEL JOSEPH LOONEY
RODERICK M. LUSTED
MICHAEL ANTHONY LUZZI
VERRDON HOLBROOK MASON
DANIEL R. MATZ
KEVIN MICHAEL MCCOY
JOSEPH JOHN MEISBERGER
KENNETH DALTON MICKELBERRY
GLEN E. MOWBRAY
ROBERT J. MYERS
JOHN C. ORZALLI
LEO DENNIS OWENS, JR
STEVEN EDWARD PETERSEN
MARK DAVID PETERSEN-OVERTON
PETER JOHN PETERSON
STEVEN W. PETRI
DOUGLAS ALAN RAY
THOMAS R. RENTZ
KENNETH PHILLIP ROEY
RAY C. ROGERS
VINCENT SALVATORE ROSSITTO
KURT DONALD SCHULZE
ANTHONY A. SHUTT
JEFFREY M. STEELE
MICHAEL ARTHUR STORM
ERNEST L. VALDES
THOMAS MICHAEL WILBUR
JAMES R. WILKINS
JEFFERY WADE WILSON
DANIEL MARVIN WISE
ROBERT JOSEPH WRIGHT

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (ENGINEERING)

To be commander

GARY MARTIN ABBOTT
BRADFORD HARLOW BAYLOR
PATRICIA LEA BECKMAN
PHILIP C. BRENNAN
DANIEL W. BURSCH
DEMPSEY BUTLER, III
MICHAEL ALAN CLASSICK
KURT RICHARD ENGEL
CHRISTOPHER L. EVANS
MICHAEL A. HECKER
K. G. HEFFERNAN
MICHAEL KEITH HOLLINGER
CHARLES MICHAEL MCCARTHY
WILLIAM RICHARD MNICH, II
RICHARD A. MOHLER
WILLIAM NEVIUS
MICHAEL LYNN NOBLE
JACK WELTON OGG
SCOTT EUGENE PALMER
CARL E. REIBER
VICTOR C. SEE, JR
JAMES ARTHUR SEVENEY
JAMES FRANCIS SMALL, JR
KENNETH MARTIN WALLACE
KARL E. YEAKEL

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (MAINTENANCE)

To be commander

JOHN CONLIN BOYCE
EDWARD MARSHALL BOYD
WILLIAM EARL DANKA
WILLIAM SIDNEY DEVEY, JR
MICHAEL DAVIS HARDEE
KENNETH DEAN HARRIS
DAVID EDWARD HOUGH
REGINALD LAWRENCE HOWARD
DONALD JAMES KRENTZ
THEODORE ALDRED MILLER
ROY DAYTON MOORE
KEVIN PAUL O'SHAUGHNESSY
STANLEY EARL PYLE
TIMOTHY FRANKLIN STREETER
THOMAS MICHAEL VANDENBERG

AVIATION DUTY OFFICERS

To be commander

EDWARD LEE CREWS, JR
GEORGE NMN GEDNEY, III
PAUL EARNEST GODDARD
CLIFFORD MYLES HARRINGTON
JAMES A. MCCRAE
JOHN HOYT WILLS

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (CRYPTOLOGY)

To be commander

MICHAEL JAMES BURKE
WAYNE KEVIN EVERS
EDWARD CURTIS FLETCHER
DUANE M. LAFONT
STEPHEN ANTHONY LAROCQUE
MICHAEL SEWELL LOESCHER
RANDALL THOMAS LYMAN
MICHAEL FRANCIS LYNN, JR
WILLIAM MCKINLEY MATTHEWS
LINDA LEE MURDOCK
JOHN MARK ODWYER
MIRIAM F. PERLBERG
DENNIS M. PRICOLO
STEVEN K. TUCKER
DENNIS MICHAEL VOLZ
SCOTT WILLIAM WITT

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE)

To be commander

ALLEN NMN BANKS
CHARLES H. BREEN
TIMOTHY J. DENNIS
DEBORAH KAY EFFEMEY
DARRYL JOHN FENGYA
JOHN PASQUAL FORTUGNO
WILLIAM BARTLETT FRANCIS
MARK FRANCIS GREER
RICK ALAN GUNDERSON
RYNN BARRINGTON OLSEN
BETH ELAINE PATRIDGE
DEIDRE HALL PISTOCHINI
JAMES ROBIN REDDIG
DANIEL NMN RUBBO
PHILIP ROBERTS SCOTTSMITH
MICHAEL ALEXANDER SLOAN
MICHAEL ALLEN STANDRIDGE
JAY MORGAN TWEED
BRUCE ROKURO WILKINSON
STUART ALLEN YAAP
WILLIAM DEWEY YOPP
DALE EDWARD HAYS
RANDALL LEE HENDERSON
GUY DAVID HOLLIDAY
JEFFREY LEE HOLLOWAY
PETER RANDALL HULL
BRUCE WAYNE INGHAM
STEVEN JOHN KNAPKE
MICHAEL FRANCIS KUHN
ALLAN R. NADOLSKI

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)

To be commander

ROBERT KOLB ANDERSON
STEPHEN BRIAN BURNETT
CHARLES MILTON FRANKLIN
NETTIE REGINA JOHNSON
JOSEPH H. MARCH
DAVID W. MORRIS
KEVIN MARC MUKRI
STEPHEN RICHARD PIETROPAOLI
JEFFREY PATRICK SMALLWOOD
JOHN MORGAN SMITH
ALFRED R. TWYMAN

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (OCEANOGRAPHY)

To be commander

WESLEY ALAN BARTON
LESTER ELLIOTT CARR, III
WILLIAM T. CURRY
MARK DIUNIZIO
CHRISTOPHER GUNDERSON
CLIFFORD D. JOHNSON
WALTER B. KINDERGAN
TIMOTHY JAMES MCGEE
DANIEL VANAUSDAL MUNGER
WILLIAM EDGAR PERTLE
FREDERICK RICHARD PFEIL
MICHAEL D. PIND
HARDI SIEGFRIED ROSNER
BRETT TYLER SHERMAN
RAY C. SIMMONS
JEROEN JOHANNES WATERREUS
ERIC J. WRIGHT

LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS (LINE)

To be commander

BRUCE JOSEPH ACTON
DANIEL BARRS
THOMAS STUART BENSON
RALPH JOSEPH BOYER, JR
DAVID ALAN CRUTZ
PETER LLOYD DARLING
MICHAEL LEE DICKENSON
FLOYD EDWARD ENGLISH
RICHARD PATRICK GILBOY
CHARLES MICHAEL HARRIS
GERALD EARL HART
NORMAN TIMHOY HO
JAMES WESLEY HOLLAND, JR
RICHARD LEE JAMES
JOEL ERNEST KERSTETER
JOHN FRANCIS KIMMEL, JR
DAVID RICHARD KRAMER
JOHN H. KUREK
JAMES LAWRENCE KURIGER
ROBERT EARL LEMASTER
JOHN FREDRICK LUNDGREN
THOMAS WILLIAM MCCARTHY
JEFFERY LEE MCCOMB
THOMAS CARTER MCELFRESH
WILLIAM DENIS MELAY
CHARLES HOWARD MUNTER
CHARLES LEWIS MURPHY, JR
RICHARD KEVIN PRENDERGAST
WILLIAM JOSEPH RUTLAND, JR
ALAN JEROME SALA
RICHARD THOMAS SANSOM
JERRY MAX SIMMONS
JOHN CLARK SIMMONS
FRANK HENRY SIMONDS, JR
ISAAC HERMAN SMITH, JR
SAMUEL MELVIN SMITH, JR
GERALD WAYNE SOUZA
DANNY VAUGHAN
ROBERT LAWRENCE WHELAN
MICHAEL EDWARD WILLIAMS
GARY L. WILLIS
WILLIAM EDWARD WOODS, JR